Who Has the Strongest Claim to Being Big Brother

JOSEF SKALSKÝ

ORWELL'S 1984 — ILLUSIONS AND REALITIES

WHO HAS
THE STRONGEST CLAIM
TO BEING
BIG BROTHER

JOSEF SKALSKÝ

Who Has the Strongest Claim to Being Big Brother

ORWELL'S 1984 — ILLUSIONS AND REALITIES

ORBIS PRESS AGENCY PRAGUE 1984

© ORBIS PRESS AGENCY

Prague 1984

Contents

Grist to the Mill of the "Forces of Light" 11
Orwell's Awakening 14
. . . and Blind Alleys 17
The 1984 "Oceania" Mirrored in *1984* 21
The Dual Motivation of the "Ministry of Peace" 25
The Umbilical Cord Running through the "Permanent Hatred" Weeks 33
The Obverse of the "Hierarchical Society": the "Inner Party" 39
. . . and the Reverse 43
Big Brother is Watching You 48
McCarthyism: "Private" and Governmental 53
Anti-Constitutional Practices of the "Protectors of the Constitution" 60
The Technology of "Vaporisation" 68
"Control of the Past": Political and Ideological Significance 78
The Syndromes and Ambitions of Atlantic Solidarity 83
The Heights of "Doublethink" 90

The year of 1984 is gradually drawing to a close. I have travelled the length and breadth of the Rhineland, but have been quite unable to find anything of what was prophesied for this year by a man this time sporting the insignia of retired General Hackett. There is not the slightest trace of any Russian or even Czech soldiers.

The people of the Rhineland, and not they alone, live in fear of something else. It is the fear of US Pershing and Cruise missiles, which have been deployed not far away, and dozens of which are already operational. This has been done in defiance of the resolute opposition to their deployment voiced by at least three-quarters of the West German public, a fact also established by a public opinion poll carried out by the West German government.

The prophecies of Amalrik have also taken a bad knock, and reams of newsprint have been wasted on boosting them. The fiasco of that venture is also testified to by Springer's *Die Welt*: there is even more talk now about the "evil empire" than there was four decades ago, so that one can hardly believe that it is about to meet its Apocalypse.

The addition of yet another exhibit has been announced at Madame Tussaud's. Visitors are met with the sullen looks of the wax replica of George Orwell, who can undoubtedly claim prime of place in having created all this mystique surrounding the year 1984, although the name he gave to this vision of a militaristic and totalitarian Oceania was a matter of sheer chance. Orwell himself recalled on many occasions that 1984 was no more than an anagram of 1948, the year he finished his book.

Time magazine frequently bases its prophecies on wishful thinking, but what we find in issue No. 23, 1983 is being really fulfilled: it looks as though hardly anyone who is paid for voicing his ideas has overcome the temptation of toying with Orwell's predictions. The game became an important one in January 1983 and, because of the heightened interest, it could well continue in 1985.

From Antwerp to Washington, futurologists are arguing with each other about what Orwell's *1984* actually means: is it a surrealistic vision, or a straight-forward warning? Gallup's people have been polling the Swiss and the British, the French and the Italians, the Spaniards and the West Germans to try to discover how close their society has come to Orwell's projections. On

both sides of the Atlantic, political scientists and sociologists, journalists and writers, professional and amateur astrologists, together with the latter-day alchemists are making a few extra dollars out of the public debate over how to assess the year 1984 through the prism of *1984*.

A brand new vogue has also made its appearance, and the tone for it was set earlier this year by *The Economist* which made a point of emphasising the "inescapable nature of the Orwell topic". Some of the scenarios project the characters and sets into the year 2084, but that is perhaps evidence of the discretion displayed by some circles. As far as we are concerned, thank goodness we are not destined to live to see Armageddon, but even the most impatient have no reason to despair. If things go the usual way, a new ray of light can be expected in Hessen because of something we heard when leaving last year's bookfair in Frankfurt: it was being said that the leit motif for this year's fair was to be — Orwell 2000.

But it was the Orwellian 1983 New Year broadcast by the French television station FR-3 that beat everything. It gave a truly down-to-earth expression of its attitude to the barbarism against which the fate of Winston Smith sounds such a warning. It chose for its author and moderator the South Korean director Nam Dzun-paik, whose country is one of those Oceania reservations where thousands upon thousands of "dissidents" have already been "vaporised". Indeed, it is in South Korea where, they say, Nam Dzun-paik has prospered, that neither Big Brother nor the "Thought Police" have met with the slightest impediment. That is

precisely where their credo — "Freedom is Slavery" has been translated into practice again and again over the decades.

Grist to the Mill of the "Forces of Light"

Those who inscribed Orwell's name on their banner upon the publication of *Animal Farm* have displayed amazing agility. The walking pillars of the "crusade" believe that "some things are more important than peace" and they have told us as much on many occasions. That too is certainly one of the springs of the solid moral superiority now claimed or arrogated by the "forces of light". The US ultra-conservative *National Review* declares that the "forces of light have Orwell on their side and draw on him for energy". Norman Podhoretz, the chief ideologist of the ultra-conservatives and the publisher of *Commentary*, their periodical prayer-book, leaves the impression of someone who could soon accuse Ronald Reagan himself of "unamerican activity". He asserted in the January issue of

Harper's Magazine that "In the present situation, Orwell's political convictions would have led him to neo-conservatism."

The motivations for that kind of inclination are notorious and they were truthfully spelled out by Orwell's compatriot Eugene Jorgen, who said that the anti-Communists accepted *1984* because they found it supported their own reactionary and arrantly nonsensical notions of socialism. But Orwell depicted what was basically an absurdity, something that has never existed and cannot exist in international relations. Orwell took the actual social content out of the concepts of "power" and "state" and tried to imagine how international relations could develop between these empty abstractions. What the bourgeois discerns through the prism of *1984* can be divined from a letter written by a Londoner terrified by the scope of anti-war demonstrations which was published in the *International Herald Tribune* on January 6, 1984: the peace movement, he claimed, could undermine the very existence of West European democracy and could eventually threaten the whole continent with the prospect of an Orwellian future.

Virtually the same thing was also admitted by some participants in an Orwellian discussion which was reported in the December issue of the US *Futurist*. Thus, Professor W. Warren Wagar of Binghampton University in New York, declared Orwell's novel to be a "cold war weapon". Burnham P. Beckwith from Palo Alto, California, held the view that *Animal Farm* and *1984* have done great service for anti-Communists throughout the world. This comes from the state of California,

one of whose recent governors was the man now leading the "forces of light".

Even Issac Deutscher regarded Orwell's novel as an "ideological cold-war superweapon" and as far as we are aware, he had never had any difficulties with the "Thought Police", whether in Orwell's Oceania or in the United States, its actually existing metropolis. The export of Deutscher's pamphlets was repeatedly financed even by Langley, mainly to places where there was growth of influence not of pseudo-revolutionaries, but of real ones. However, this man with such unsavoury connections declared some time ago that no other book or document has given such a powerful depiction of the panic fear of Communism that struck the West round about the year 1950. He pointed out that the then *Saturday Review of Literature* reported that a journalist who had been offered *1984* at a New York bookstore was told that it was required reading material in order to understand why the atomic bomb had to be dropped on the Bolsheviks.

Orwell's Awakening. . .

But let us be fair: the compliments voiced by Norman Podhoretz would also without doubt be politely rejected by most West European prime ministers, and naturally for the most noble reasons and in the spirit of "Atlantic solidarity". George Orwell himself would hardly have welcomed that kind of flattery.

Orwell did not live a long life — he died when he was not yet 47 — and he came to experience both the splendours and the filth of the democracy which is said to be "pure" or even "boundless". His reminiscences of serving in the British Imperial Police in Burma are symptomatic: he recalls that the way Great Britain was running India was nothing better than fascism. He left the service to live as a tramp in Paris and London's East

End, frequently in the queue for a plate of Salvation Army soup. During the Great Depression of the 1930s, he had some bitter truths to tell the readers of the philistine press about the life of London's unemployed.

He never joined the Tories, but was at one time a member of the Independent Labour Party. That was when he went to Spain and gun in hand helped to defend the republic against Franco and his Nazi sponsors. It will do no harm to recall that the predecessors of Norman Podhoretz then put their stake on "appeasement", which in practice meant a total boycott of help to the Republicans, and extensive, though highly covert, aid to the brown plague, which was determined to put an end to every brand of democracy. In November 1936, the US Ambassador to Paris William Bullitt assured the French Foreign Minister Yvon Delbos that, unless Franco was given aid right away, Spain would soon find itself in the hands of the Communists, to be shortly followed by Portugal. Franco himself later admitted that without US trucks and without US credits, he would have never won the war. It was that aid which effectively helped to keep Spain and Portugal under the fascist yoke right up until the 1970s.

George Orwell himself said that the heirs of the French, English and American revolutions partly believed in their own rhetoric about human rights, freedom of speech and equality before the law, but added that not a single government was able to keep its citizens under constant control. But now every citizen would be under police surveillance and under the influence of official propaganda for 24 hours a day. The possibility of

forcing a citizen to completely submit to the will of the state and to profess utterly stereotyped views on every issue had appeared for the first time in history, and that when economic inequality had become permanent.

Orwell also wrote on several occasions that in his *1984*, he had depicted both his experience with British imperialism in the East and with the Spanish fascist dictatorship. In the closing years of his life, he opposed the invisible spread of the power of the monopolies which threatened universal freedom.

Norman Podhoretz's crusading spirit could well be dampened by recollections of the following episode. There was a time when he himself quoted Orwell as saying that capitalism is doomed to disappear because it leads to dole queues, stock-exchange crashes and wars. To this Podhoretz responded with unconcealed bitterness when he said that in this century of ours nothing is worse for an intellectual than to completely repudiate Socialism.

. . . and Blind Alleys

Once again the whole thing was naturally exaggerated by the McCarthyite telescreen, and we suspect why. It was undoubtedly under the influence of the trend which tends to gain in strength the louder it is denounced. As much is admitted by those who can hardly be suspected of heresy. David Newson, one-time US Assistant Secretary of State and head of the Institute of Diplomacy at Georgetown University, which is one of the spiritual centres of Reagan's panoply, recently wrote on the pages of the *Christian Science Monitor* to complain that the rest of the world does not believe what they are saying about the Russians. Indeed, he admitted, most foreigners are apparently more willing to believe what the Russians say about the United States than what we say about them.

In a book entitled *Marx and Marxism*, by P. Worsley, recently published in New York, we find the author saying that it is virtually impossible to find any area of sociological thinking that has not, in one way or another, been under the influence of Marx's ideas or the social realities of the societies built on the principles of Marxism.

Someone in *Frankfurter Rundschau* wrote in March of 1983: "It looks as though Marx has become a household word among the exploited and the dispossessed."

It is even more remarkable to read what US General Alexander Haig thinks about the advance of socialism: whether we like it or not, he says, the attractiveness of Marxist systems has grown.

In his book about Soviet-American relations, A. Rapoport hit the mark when he admitted that capitalist ideology, which lays emphasis on private initiative, is incapable of offering the society any great ideals that would unite the whole people, and that therein lies the main reason behind the need for the "Communist threat".

The alarm sounded by the "Thought Police" of Orwell's empire can be quietly called off. Orwell never escaped from his abstract schemata, which were also welcomed by dark reaction. On the contrary, he was increasingly their captive as time went on, and so necessarily also of the prejudice with respect to the revolutionary working-class movement, the enemies of which his works had repeatedly served.

Take *Animal Farm*, the second best-known of his novels, which he wrote in the closing years of the Second

World War, a period of hardship, most of all for people of the Soviet Union. Indeed, the destiny of the whole of Europe, and even more than that, was being decided on the Soviet-German front. Thanks to the blows inflicted on the Nazis by the Soviet Army, blows which cost great loss of life and sacrifice, Hitler had to abandon the idea of invading the British Isles. At that time, this was recognised even by Winston Churchill, a man who was hard to outdo in his anti-Soviet malice. On June 22, 1941, the day of the attack on the Soviet Union, Churchill declared in a radio broadcast that Hitler wanted to destroy the Russian state because, in the event of success, he could concentrate the main forces of his army and air force and hurl them against the British Isles. This was why the threat facing Russia was also a threat facing Britain and the United States, while the cause of every Russian fighting for hearth and home was also the cause of all free men and free nations in every part of the world.

And on whose side was *Animal Farm*? The parable it related was welcomed not only by the bourgeois. It did not sound merely as approval of the insolence with which they regard their privileges as "natural". The parody of a mutiny of animals which led them from plenty to starvation, from a carefree existence to backbreaking toil, from the hands of the "kindly farmer" to the imposter's whip — that was a pleasant message for those who were shouting about the "degeneration" of Soviet power in a situation in which the plans for its armed liquidation were being exploded one by one. The transparent allegory of the pig Napoleon sucking on his pipe and swopping allies among the

neighbouring farmers was not only adding grist to the mill of those who wanted to attach falsely to the Soviet Union the ignominy of their "appeasement" of Hitler. It was also designed to smear the Soviet people, who were then breaking the backbone of the fascist beast in the interests of the whole of mankind. The metaphors of *Animal Farm* left the impression of ridiculing every social revolution, and not just the proletarian revolution, whatever Orwell himself may have thought of it. It was also a slap in the face for people like Maximilian Robespierre, Thomas Jefferson, Guiseppe Garibaldi, Oliver Cromwell and other personalities and hundreds of thousands of unknown fighters of the anti-feudal revolutions. Indeed, it would have drawn applause from the Bourbons, the Habsburgs and the counts of Hohenzollern.

The 1984 "Oceania" Mirrored in *1984*

The Orwellian theme also runs in other directions, opposite to that which the self-styled "forces of light" so laboriously advertise. Indeed, in many ways they run well beyond the horizon which George Orwell himself had in view.

Led us consider at random some of those who use the *1984* yardstick to measure the "Oceania" of 1984:

Among the most unassuming — which is not surprising — is *US News and World Report*, which said that in the United States it is the technology and not the politics of *1984* that is markedly closer to reality. In the introduction to a recent edition of *1984*, Erich Fromm writes that the subconscious aspect of *1984* Doublethink is designed to convince many readers that the Doublethink method is being practised by the Russians, al-

though it is quite alien to themselves. He says that his society is presented as one based on free initiative, individualism and idealism, although in reality those are mere words. Furthermore he confesses that his is a centralised society of a pronounced bureaucratic type and admits that in the West the "free world" is often spoken about, in which, however, the South African dictatorship is also included. He points out that it has been supported by the West throughout the whole of its existence, as well as various forms of dictatorship, like that of Franco, Salazar, the one in Pakistan, and elsewhere.

This was echoed by Eugene Jorgen, who says that many views are being expressed in bourgeois liberal circles today about the partial fulfilment of Orwell's political forecasts in the United States and other capitalist countries, as will be seen from the growing interference in the private lives of individuals by the bureaucratic power apparatus and the imperialist monopolies, the manipulation of consciousness, the trampling of individual freedoms, the establishment of an all-encompassing system of lying political propaganda, the development of techniques for surveillance, eavesdropping, and so on.

At the beginning of February, we read the following in *Süddeutsche Zeitung*: "Orwellian Newspeak, which makes it possible to turn everything into its opposite, functions like everything else in Bonn when it comes to holding on to power."

Edward Cornish admits in the *Futurist* that members of the judiciary are frequently connected with the atrocities of the Thought Police.

Even a commentator of the London *Times* said that it is true that Orwell's horrible vision does to some extent reflect the dark side of British reality, just as it is true that his warning applies to the present Western world with its banks, computers and lie-detectors. Orwell correctly perceived that capitalism has "vaporised the individual", "it extinguishes thought, demands ceaseless war and puts down other philosophies".

Let us also take note of the reminder given by the Hamburg *Stern*:

"The thinking of the sick writer was increasingly concentrated on the future of his son. 'Some tell me that Richard is not made for literature, but for technology. I should like him to become a farmer. That would be the only kind of work that would be left after an atomic bomb.' He believed that in those islands (a lonely Hebridian island where Orwell had to stay because of his bad health), man would somehow be able to survive. He could not imagine at the time that in 1984 US nuclear weapons would be deployed within 60 kilometres of those islands. . .

"George Orwell lies buried at Sutton Courtenay, a village south of Oxford. . . Within a range of 35 kilometres of it one will now find the following: the nuclear research centre at Harwell, the JET cyclotron project, several US bases for nuclear bombers, a nuclear weapons research laboratory, a Polaris missile factory, NATO headquarters in the contingency of a nuclear strike at Central Europe, and recently also the silos for Cruise missiles."

But the most remarkable comment has, after all,

come straight from Downing Street. The "Iron Lady" herself declared on the threshold of the New Year:

"George Orwell was wrong. For Britain, 1984 will be a year of hope and freedom."

From this most competent source has come another confirmation of what Orwell always emphasised. In a letter to his friend he wrote that he had decided to make Great Britain the scene of the events above all to emphasise that the English-speaking peoples are no better than any others, and that totalitarianism could triumph anywhere, unless we combat it. He added that he was writing this because there were lies that had to be exposed.

Let us now follow in the footsteps of this man who did not move only in the realm of his fantasy, despite the efforts of the forces to the right of Reagan to put him on his own pedestal.

The Dual Motivation of the "Ministry of Peace"

"In earlier ages, class distinctions had been not only inevitable but desirable. Inequality was the price of civilisation. With the development of machine-production, however, the case was altered. Even if it was still necessary for human beings to do different kinds of work, it was no longer necessary for them to live at different social or economic levels." That much the rulers of Orwell's Oceania had also come to realise. They discovered the way to preserve class distinction in the form of militarism. The credo of Big Brother's cohorts went like this: "The primary aim of modern warfare. . . is to use up the products of the machine without raising the general standard of living. . . Even when weapons of war are not actually destroyed, their manufacture is still a convenient way of expending labour

power without producing anything that can be consumed."

It is a pity that the spokesmen of the military-industrial complex do not express themselves with equal frankness. Their profits have been growing twice and three times as fast as those in the civilian sector. When about to leave office, Dwight D. Eisenhower spotlighted another side of the coin, when he said that every gun that is made, every warship that is launched, every missile complex ultimately robs those who hunger, who are cold, and who have nothing to wear.

A mere 8—10 per cent of the amount annually being appropriated for weapons would be enough to rid the developing countries of hunger and diseases caused by hunger. That was demonstrated by UN experts. The arguments used in "Oceania" to justify militarism no longer hold water, and this is being recognised even by those who belong to its "Inner Party".

There are almost 35 million unemployed in the industrialised capitalist countries, which is 11 million more than during the world capitalist crisis of the 1930s. Caspar Weinberger keeps saying that "military programmes provide new job opportunities and possibilities for investment". That the very opposite is true has not escaped even the masterminds of "Reaganomics". The following recently came from the Chicago School, which is regarded in some circles as the top dog in this field: "The reconversion of arms to civilian production would create at least the 6.7 million missing job opportunities, apart from its future positive effects."

These job opportunities are being limited by militarisation, because it impedes the development of the other economic sectors. However, the structure of military investments has also undergone an important change, for an ever larger share of them goes into the purchase of expensive machinery and equipment, materials and energy, and that means the provision of fewer jobs. The blind alley of militarisation has acquired some new aspects. There is a decline in the number of jobs in the arms concerns themselves. Here is an example: from 1968 to 1978, US military spending went up by more than $ 30,000 million, while 1.1 million jobs were lost in the arms industry. We find the same thing in Great Britain, which has the fastest pace of armament after Washington. It is expected that by 1987, 200,000 jobs will have been lost in arms manufacture itself.

Meanwhile, arms production provides a hothouse atmosphere for the artificial inflation of prices. Last spring, *US News and World Report* said that the prices of weapons and materiel were growing twice as fast as those in the civilian sphere, and that President Reagan himself has complained that the Pentagon pays 100 dollars for a diode which costs 4 cents, or 900 dollars for a plastic cap.

In 1980, the US national debt stood at $ 914,300 million; this year it is expected to reach $ 1,606,300 million, which roughly equals one-half of the country's gross national product. The national debt is being increased above all by the cost of the arms race, a source of fabulous profits, which are not subject to any entrepreneurial risks for the banks — the creditors of the state — who finance the arms race. The interest paid on the US na-

tional debt came to $ 75,200 million in 1980; this year it is twice as high — $ 144,500 million. A full third of the taxes paid by the rank-and-file taxpayers last year was used up on paying the interest on the national debt. If we add the actual repayments, the total adds up to 80 cents in every dollar going into military preparations.

The annual outlays on military research and development in the United States have gone up to $ 32,000 million, as compared with $ 15,000 million in 1980. By contrast, outlays on civilian research and development have gone down from $ 17,000 million to $ 14,000 million. The per-unit research and development outlays on arms manufacture are something like 20 times higher than those in civilian manufacture. That was admitted in June 1980 by the magazine *Business Week*. What is more, military research and development increasingly serve only purely militaristic purposes. The assertions that they are still the motive force behind scientific and technical progress in the civilian sphere were refuted in a study of the economic and social consequences of the arms race and military expenditures in 1978. It presented the facts to show that research for non-military purposes is being used in the military sphere to a much greater extent than is military research in the civilian sphere. On the whole, there is convincing evidence to show how little that is new in the civilian sphere was obtained from research and its application in the military sphere.

In the fiscal year 1981/1982, state expenditures for social purposes were cut back by $ 49,000 million. In the fiscal year 1985/1986, the figure is to go up to more than

$ 100,000 million, and the dynamic growth of the US military budget shows just where these funds are going. From 1979 to 1982, the US military budget went up from $ 105,100 million to $ 215,900 million, which means that it more than doubled within a mere three years. Washington's defence directive for 1984—1988 counts with an astronomical amount of money, and it falls just short of the amount which Washington wasted on weapons in the 35 years after the war. In 1985, it expects to have $ 323,000 million, in 1986 — $ 357,000 million, in 1987 — $ 389,000 million and in 1988 — $ 425,000 million. The share of military expenditures in the state budget in 1987 is to go up to 37 per cent. At the beginning of the present decade it was 23 per cent.

However, George Orwell was also deeply wrong on yet another thing. Those whom he depicted in his novel do not go in for armaments only for the sake of profit. The real "prime goal" was expressed by W. S. Schlamm, one-time spokesman for West German reaction. His book, *The Boundaries of the Miracle* (Die Grenzen des Wunders) was published in the late 1950s and this makes all the more tangible everything that the herald of the "Inner Party" made no secret of:

"The fearful essence of the conflict between Communism and the West lies in the fact that Communism flourishes in peace, that it wants peace, and triumphs in peace. . . If the prevention of a world war is regarded as being more important than the prevention of a Communist triumph, then there is naturally nothing that can avert such a triumph. . . The actual acceptance of peaceful coexistence would signify abandonment of a victory

for the West in the cold war and would simultaneously be a recognition of its defeat."

Present-day Washington is guided by a similar "philosophy", which in the 1970s had somewhat receded into the backround. It is now being propounded by Colin S. Gray and Keith Payne. It will do no harm to recall what they wrote in *Foreign Policy* in 1980, claiming that victory was possible. They claimed that a nuclear war was possible, and that many commentators and senior government officials were doing a lot of harm by claiming that it was impossible to survive such a war. If US nuclear power was to back up US foreign-policy objectives, the United States should be capable of fighting a nuclear war, and if the defeat of the Soviet state was declared to be the objective of the war, the military professionals should get down to working out an optimal plan to attain that objective. Strategists were unable to offer painless conflicts, but they could assert that a common-sense offensive strategy together with the defence of one's country should be designed to keep the human losses down to roughly 20 million. A nuclear war should evidently be fought above all to force the Soviet Union to give up some of its earlier gains.

At hearings before a House Committee in 1981, US Secretary of State Caspar Weinberger declared that the incumbent administration would increase the potential of deterrence or the ability to fight a global war against the Soviet Union.

Reagan's National Security Directive No. 32, which was adopted in April 1982, made these mad plans the basis of official policy: a "first, disarming nuclear strike"

must above all be the guarantee of "victory in a nuclear war". It assumes that the United States must ensure the superiority of its nuclear forces even in a protracted war, so as to force the Soviet Union to suspend military operations on terms dictated by the United States.

This was reaffirmed by subsequent statements in which Washington commented on its new doctrine. On August 9, 1982, Caspar Weinberger declared that all of the Pentagon's efforts were aimed at attaining superiority over the USSR in a nuclear war. Colin Gray revealed that the United States is working on a plan to destroy the USSR, and its objectives in the war would be ultimately to liquidate the Soviet political system and set up a post-war order in the world that would be compatible with Western values.

In early June 1982, Springer's *Die Welt* admitted: "The Pentagon's new "defence planning' essentially consists of plans for a war designed to defeat the Soviet Union on any level, ranging from insurrections, which can be started and used, to war, including nuclear war."

George Orwell died on the threshold of the nuclear age, but he was perfectly aware that "war has in fact changed its character", he wrote in *1984*, so that a global conflict would no longer be the same kind of war as it was in the early 20th century. Even if weapons were developed capable of killing hundreds of millions of people in a matter of seconds, the aggressor would be unable to destroy the other side, unless he wanted to destroy himself as well. The rulers of Oceania depicted by Orwell came to realise as much. "Oceania's" present-day rulers also have to reckon with that fact. That is why

they cannot be allowed to attain a superiority that could tempt them to take the fatal step. That is why everyone who wants to prevent that from happening must make his voice heard.

The Umbilical Cord Running through the "Permanent Hatred" Weeks

Oceania's "collective oligarchy" reckoned that "the consciousness of being at war and therefore in danger makes the handing-over of all power to a small caste seem the natural, unavoidable condition of survival". Now and again the "Two Minutes Hate", a daily ritual, was punctuated with a "Hate Week". Orwell describes its culmination as follows: "A new poster had suddenly appeared all over London. It had no caption, and represented simply the monstrous figure of a Eurasian soldier, three or four metres high, striding forward with expressionless Mongolian face and enormous boots, a submachine gun pointed from his hip. From whatever angle you looked at the poster, the muzzle of the gun magnified by the foreshortening seemed to be pointed straight at you. The thing had

been plastered on every blank space on every wall, even outnumbering the portraits of Big Brother."

The actual rudiments of this parable were discovered in the period in which Orwell was still growing up, and the most perceptive of those who belonged to the "Inner Party" did not fail to discern either their role or their umbilical cord. Among them was the US journalist Walter Lippmann, initially an advocate of anti-Soviet intervention. But on January 28, 1920, when the intervention was still in full swing, he wrote a noteworthy article with Charles Merz under the remarkable title "Red Hysteria". It appeared in the American weekly, *The New Republic*. The two authors said that all the country's problems of that day were rooted in lies: official lies, unofficial lies and plausible lies, and the American people were beginning to realise this. All the hysterical, inordinate and entangled intolerance of those days was connected with the main lie, the lie with which the people are being infected so as to make them carry on the war against the Russian people. A monstrous and gigantic propaganda lie had been disgorged on mankind in order to maintain the ignominious blockade against a people craving peace and to spark off a fratricidal war in Russia. It was a lie that the Russians trusted Kolchak and Denikin. It was a lie that they did not want the Soviet government but those which were one after another offered by the generals of the Entente and the monarchist cliques. It was a lie that the Russians were preparing to invade peaceful Europe. It was a lie that the Russians did not offer an honest and guaranteed peace. The lie about

Russia was the mother of every other lie. And as such that lie should be damned.

Let us recall what Hans Fritsche, Goebbels's deputy at the Reich propaganda ministry, said in his speech at the Nuremberg Tribunal, where the Nazi war criminals were in the dock:

"We organised a wide campaign of anti-Soviet propaganda in the hope of convincing public opinion that it was the Soviet Union and not Germany which was to blame for the war. We had no grounds at all for accusing the USSR of preparing an attack against Germany."

Meanwhile, the warning sounded by George Kistiakowski, President Dwight D. Eisenhower's adviser, was also admitted by dozens of other Western leaders: the practice of spreading myths about the Soviet Union's intentions and the "gaps" in US armaments in various military fields is too well-known, and before one falsification has been exposed, the ground is already being prepared for another.

However, the problems facing the "Ministry of Truth" nowadays are immensely more formidable. A tide of resistance has welled up against the sinister preparations and the rhetoric that is to cover it up, and no secret of it is being made even by those who have won the distinction of being "Big Brother's" cohorts. In early 1980, Professor Stanley Hoffmann wrote in *Foreign Affairs* that the anti-nuclear movement of our day is a new and dangerous one in several ways: it is a mass movement of continental proportions which mobilises and leads people across borders; it unites members of diffe-

rent political parties; it is strongest in the Federal Republic of Germany, a country which had until now been the most reliable partner of the United States on the continent and the pivot of NATO strategy; it is frequently led by well-known clergymen, intellectuals and politicians; it is predominantly an assembly of young people; the spread of the West European popular movement against the deployment of new weapons signifies the existence of a deep and destabilising gulf between the governments and a sizable and potentially active part of the public; at stake is much more than merely technical problems: they are symptoms of fundamental problems.

The policy which is pushing the world to a nuclear disaster is countered not only in the ideas of peaceful coexistence, but also in the people's own experience of detente, and it is the vibrant recollection of it which explains — as the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* said in January — why "Soviet peace proposals still have an influence on Western public opinion: every new detail tends to catch the headlines in the papers." Even more was admitted in *Foreign Affairs* (No. 5, 1982), when it said that the experience gained in the period of detente has markedly changed the overall West European view of the Soviet Union.

A telling comment on the salvoes of hatred which are designed to counter these changes came from George F. Kennan, who, one should bear in mind, was one of the architects of the cold war of the 1940s and 1950s. In the first year of Reagan as President, Kennan said that the current anti-Soviet campaigns were designed totally

to dehumanise the enemy, to give "moral credit" and the false hallmark of "political realism" to the preparations for nuclear aggression. The efforts to falsify the policy and life of the socialist countries have caused apprehension even in the ranks of the "Inner Party". The wide gap between Reagan's slogans and the actual facts has been exposed by many an orthodox believer, like Stephen F. Cohen, whose article in *International Herald Tribune* on July 27, 1983, echoed Walter Lippmann's approach. It exposed the myth of a collapsing Soviet system, adding that every generation of Western opinion was exposed to some fresh myth about the Soviet Union and its allies. Just now it was the "decline and crisis" of the Soviet system. If this image of crisis-ridden Soviet regimes tottering on the brink of disaster were not so dangerous, it could be dismissed out of hand as a mere absurdity. But unfortunately it is the basis of the idea which is so popular in the Reagan Administration that a US policy based on fresh rounds in the arms race and total economic war could destroy the Soviet Union and its satellites or at least "bring them to their knees". The most misleading assertion is that the Soviet Communist regimes have recently failed to live up to their basic domestic promises, writes Stephen F. Cohen.

He has to admit that Soviet Communism at home definitely signifies official promises of national security, social care from the cradle to the grave, better material standards for every new generation, and law and order, and that despite some shortcomings, the established social system provides free education, health care, pension security, subsidised housing and foodstuffs for vir-

tually all citizens, and that from the standpoint of most material indicators, ordinary citizens now live better than ever before in the past: from 1950 to 1980, for instance, real consumption per head increased at least three-fold.

Those are surprising words coming from such a source, but nowadays they are in no sense the exception, and there are any number of colourful testimonials that Reagan's "crusade" is becoming counter-productive. The idea was to array almost the whole world against the "evil empire", but even avowed spokesmen for reaction are now turning their backs on the chimeric anti-Soviet fantasies that are designed to justify the preparations for war, and we find them saying things which they themselves in the past used to brand as "Communist propaganda".

The Obverse of the "Hierarchical Society": the "Inner Party"...

Philosophers of the "pre-Oceania age" erroneously assumed that a "hierarchical society was only possible on a basis of poverty and ignorance", but they were disabused by George Orwell's sad heros. And they are also put right by the relations prevailing in the "Oceania" of our own day.

If we are to believe the neon-light advertisements, the "Affluent Society" has now been going for something like a quarter of a century. Still, a full 70 per cent of all the assets and profits are concentrated in the hands of no more than 350 corporations, which make up only 0.002 per cent of all the enterprises, and employ more than two-thirds of the "proles".

A mere 0.3 per cent of the US population owns 22 per cent of the national wealth of the United States, but 60

per cent of the US population, at the other end of the social scale, owns only 7.5 per cent. Over the past 30 years, monopoly profits have multiplied more than 5-fold, while the rate of exploitation of the working people has more than doubled.

In 1977, towards the end of the first third of the "crisis decade", which has now entered its second decade, we find the semi-official Harris Institute of Public Opinion saying that the nation-wide public opinion polls taken in the 1970s revealed that an average of 80 per cent of the citizens are convinced that in the United States the rich are getting richer and the poor poorer, a view shared in 1966 only by about 45 per cent of those polled. These polls also showed that most Americans believe that there is no justice for the poor, that the people in power are no longer trusted, that the government is depriving the people of their freedom, and that too much attention is being paid to groups which constitute a minority of the population.

It appears that Walter Wrinston, chairman of the Board of the First National Bank, has already taken over from David Rockefeller the title of "Mr. Establishment", so that what he says must carry a lot of weight, and he says that "history shows that when a citizen loses his economic freedom, he also loses along with it his political freedom". The US political scientists D. Simpson and G. Beam are of the same view, and not even the Thought Police of Oceania could accuse them of being guilty of "Thoughtcrime", because "pluralism" is their measure of life in their country, the same weapon they use in their attacks across the "iron curtain" on orders either of the "Ministry of Truth" or of the "Ministry of Love". It is all the more curious, to say the least, to find them saying in their book *Strategy for Change* that they can no longer tolerate a state of affairs when life in their country is half-just and half-free. They also feel that the United States cannot be regarded as a country ruled by democracy because the voters cannot decide the government's political line by their votes, while the elected representatives do not adequately represent the popular interest and the government is alienated from the people.

When Abraham Lincoln was running for Congress, he borrowed $ 200 from his friends to cover the costs of his electoral campaign. When he was elected, he paid back $ 199.25 and spent the remaining 75 cents on a reception for his supporters whom he regaled with apple juice. A similar electoral campaign in 1952 cost more than $ 30 million; in 1964 — about $ 187.5 million, and in 1968 — almost $ 300 million. *US News and World Report* said that in 1976, the candidates of both parties spent in the course of all the campaigns — from country courts to the White House — a total of something like $ 545 million. In 1980, the figure was already $ 600 million, roughly half of it going to finance the presidential campaign.

These "voluntary donations" return to the monopolies as much-yearned-for profits, and this is twice as true under the incumbent US president, who has taken care of the privileges of the top US elite even more solicitously than all his predecessors had done. He claims to be a "President of all the Americans". But that does not appear to be so in the light of the elementary rules of democ-

racy: in the last presidential elections just over one-half of the electorate went to the polls, and just over one-half of them voted for Ronald Reagan, which means that the "President of all the Americans" was elected by the votes of only 27 per cent of all the Americans entitled to vote.

Lobbying is a popular American pastime. About 6,500 lobbyists are officially registered in the United States, and they are paid an average of $ 65,000 by the monopolies to "work on" each of the 553 members of the Congress. That is roughly ten times more than the annual family income officially regarded in the United States as the "poverty line". Even Simon Cameron, Republican Party boss in the state of Pennsylvania had to admit in 1860 that an "honest politician" is a man who "when bought stays bought".

The truth about this much-speculated-upon Orwellian pluralism was revealed by Woodrow Wilson, who, as the Democratic Party's presidential candidate in 1912, declared in his book *The New Freedom*, that there was a time when the corporations had a very inconspicuous role to play in US enterprise, but American industry was no longer as free as it had once been. US enterprise was no longer free: a man with small capital finds it ever harder to start some kind of business and ever more impossible to compete with big business. Why? Because the laws of the United States do not prevent the strong from oppressing the weak. And since the strong have strangulated the weak, they now control industry and the whole life of the country.

. . . and the Reverse

There was no doubt that Orwell was right, and he is even more so today. "Poverty and ignorance" still beset the "hierarchical society", despite the fact that "the wheels of its industry" could long ago have completely eliminated "hunger, overwork, dirt, illiteracy and disease".

The point was further driven home by Ronald Reagan on January 10, 1984, when he told newsmen that he had met with members of a special Senate Committee to wipe out hunger in the United States, a country to which "God had given vast resources". The Committee had assured him that hunger could not be justified in that "land of plenty".

When the US Senate Committee on Poverty was set up in 1969, Senator Robert Kennedy declared that more

than 14 million Americans went to bed hungry every night. Ten years later, the Senate discussed a new study by its own committee on "Hunger in the United States", and its verdict was that there had been no change for the better.

From 1976 to 1981 alone, the number of Americans living below the officially recognised poverty line increased by 7 million. In that same period, monopoly profits went up by 46 per cent. The dividends they paid out went up by 75 per cent, from $ 37 000 million to $ 65 000 million. This was further compounded by "Reaganomics". In late 1982, 31.8 million people were living below the officially established poverty line. By the end of last year, the figure had gone up to 35 million.

Senator Edward Kennedy has published a voluminous document on hunger in America, and it was introduced to the public at a press conference last December, when he said that hunger was beginning to rage in the United States for the first time since the Great Depression of the early 1930s. In 1982 alone, the number of those who had to seek food aid more than doubled, and in some areas multiplied more than four-fold. Over the past two winters, 29 people froze to death in New York. In 44 other states, more than 200 people froze to death last winter.

The US Department of Education had to admit that among adult citizens in the United States at least one million were completely illiterate, and another 23 million "functionally" illiterate, which meant that they were "unable effectively to act as independent citizens".

In another book on the crisis of the US health system,

Edward Kennedy says that an American who had the misfortune to suffer from some heart, cardiovascular or kidney disease or whose health was threatened by some other illness faced inevitable financial bankruptcy: within a matter of weeks his family would lose its home and all its savings.

The list of absurdities coming from Oceania's "Ministry of Truth" is unrivalled, and this also applies to the "Hate Weeks" like those addressed to Czechoslovakia. But there is at least one exception: no one has yet ascribed to us anything like the "poverty line", or claimed that a single person was living below that line. Indeed, it is impossible to find in countries where the people are actually in power palatial homes of billionaires and queues of people vainly waiting for jobs, the strutting luxury of the latifundists and the drudgery of the seasonal day-labourers, hungry people and working children.

George Orwell did not think that the labour of the exploited peoples living on either side of the Equator did the world economy much good, because it did not increase the world's wealth. The facts tell a totally different story. Let us recall, at least, some of the documents and publications issued in the recent period by the United Nations and other international bodies like FAO, UNICEF, UNESCO, WHO, and UNCTAD:

Every dollar invested by the transnational monopolies in the less developed countries yields on average $ 2.40 in profit, and the US transnationals extract roughly twice as much.

Johannes Rau, a prominent leader of the West Ger-

man SPD admitted in *Die Neue Gesellschaft* (1983, No. 6): "We continue to obtain important raw materials from the developing countries at prices which those countries are right in regarding as exploitive, and on which we ourselves will not be able to insist in the future." The Asian, African and Latin American countries receive an average of only 15 per cent of the price of their natural resources paid by customers in the United States, Western Europe and Japan, the rest — minus freight charges and an adequate share of processing costs — flows into the vaults of the transnational concerns.

By means of the so-called brain drain — the luring away of skilled personnel from the less developed countries — the United States has saved at least $ 100,000 million since the beginning of the 1950s.

In 1983, the hourly rate for US workers in engineering averaged $ 7.55, while US monopolies in South Korea paid an average of $ 1.53 per hour and in Taiwan — $ 1.43.

The direct damage caused to the less developed countries by neo-colonialist policy now already adds up to $ 90,000 — 100,000 million a year. Over the past three decades, imperialism has extracted from the developing world more than the colonial metropolitan countries did over a period of three centuries.

The results of the neo-colonialist plunder are alarming: something like 750 million people in the developing world suffer from hunger, while another 500 million suffer from permanent malnutrition.

Every day, up to 40,000 children die of hunger and

hunger-induced diseases; 15 out of 100 children born in the developing world do not survive their first year; and medical care is accessible only to every one in 9 or 10 children.

At the beginning of the 1980s, the developing countries had 820 million adults who were unable to read or write, and their numbers have been steadily growing; 400 million people in the developing world are doomed to full or partial unemployment; about 150 million children are employed by the foreign monopolies to boost profits.

Big Brother is Watching You

Those words surrounded the inhabitants of Orwell's Oceania on every hand. "Whichever way you turned, the telescreen faced you. . . Even when he is alone he can never be sure that he is alone. Wherever he may be, asleep or awake, working or resting, in his bath or in bed, he can be inspected without warning and without knowing that he is being inspected. . . His friendships, his relaxations, his behaviour towards his wife and children, the expression of his face when he is alone, the words he mutters in sleep, even the characteristic movements of his body, are all jealously scrutinized."

In our day, the "Ministry of Love" also sets itself high objectives: the US Administration, as the US magazine *Parade* writes, keeps tabs on its citizens by means of

6,723 different types of card indexes, with a total of 3,900 million personal records. This makes 18 personal files on every person in the country, including new-born babies.

The National Security Agency (NSA) is the centre of the present-day US telescreen, both in the United States itself and in foreign countries. It is the most secret and the most important of all the secret services, and its activity was well described by Senator Frank Church in the mid-1970s, when he became chairman of the Special Senate Committee investigating the activity of US intelligence and secret police outfits following the Watergate and other similar scandals. Church said that their facilities could one day be directed against the American people, who would not be left any privacy at all. Americans would have nowhere to hide, because the technological potentialities made available to the government by the secret service community could enable it to establish total tyranny.

"Technotyranny" is the word James Bamford used to describe it in a book entitled *The Puzzle Palace*. One-time US Attorney-General Ramsay Clark declared that this audiovisual invasion could soon produce a society in which no one would be sure whether his every step was being shadowed and his every word eavesdropped.

Westbrook Peggler, who used to collaborate with the FBI, said that the FBI's personal files and records contain "legal evidence" testifying to the treasonable acts of hundreds of thousands of Americans. They include records not only of absolutely accurate facts about criminals and their activity, but also numerous reports about

various individuals who had never been accused of criminal acts at all. The FBI, he added, is the largest reservoire of human dirt ever produced in the world.

Let us take another look at the Final Report issued by the Church Committee[1]:

A law prohibiting telephone tapping was passed in the United States in 1934. At the beginning of the 1940s, in view of the extraordinary conditions of wartime, President Roosevelt gave the US Justice Department instructions to permit the tapping of telephone conversations whenever the national interest was involved. Roosevelt's order remained in force even after 1945, but then it served the purposes of "the cold war". Under the Roosevelt Administration, FBI agents more or less observed the formalities and asked the Justice Department for permission to tap telephones. After Roosevelt's death, when the FBI became virtually an independent "ministry", almost every rank-and-file agent of the FBI was able to invade the privacy of Americans whenever he felt like doing so.

In 1956, the FBI already had records with the most diverse personal information — most of it collected without the knowledge of the citizens concerned — about 141,231,773 Americans, among them at least 112,016,177 — the Church Committee admitted — were

[1] Intelligence Activities and the Rights of Americans. Final Report of the Senate Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, US Senate, Washington 1976; Supplementary Detailed Reports in Intelligence Activities and the Rights of Americans. Final Report, US Senate, Washington 1976.

those who had never been in conflict either with the law or the interests of national security.

In 1960 alone, FBI agents were keeping under surveillance 200 organisations of the "Communist front" or suspected of belonging to it. As early as the 1950s, the FBI had developed several "schools of acoustics", which enabled FBI agents to bug altogether unexpected places. They were also trained in the art of secretly breaking into private homes and in "putting to sleep" their owners if they returned home unexpectedly.

From 1969 to the mid-1970s — and only according to the evidence which the FBI did not manage to conceal during the Church Committee hearings — FBI agents tapped the telephone conversations of 350,000 Americans.

From 1953 to 1973, 1.5 million American families were blacklisted by the CIA.

Some of the measures taken after the Church Committee revelations were no more than cosmetic. Ronald Reagan himself described the status the CIA now enjoys under the US Administration. In a speech in 1982 at a CIA gathering in Langley, he stressed that the United States was starting a world-wide campaign for democracy, and that the CIA had to be in the front ranks of that struggle.

William Casey, who now heads the CIA, was the first CIA chief to become a fully-fledged member of the US Administration, an honour denied even to Allen Dulles. What does all of this mean for the democratic forces in the United States? The answer was provided at the beginning of the CIA's Reagan-Bush era by D. Edwards,

Chairman of a House Subcommittee for Human and Constitutional Rights: the CIA has been fully re-instated in the business of domestic espionage.

McCarthyism: "Private" and Governmental

The US government encourages "private initiative" in putting down "subversive elements". The American Security Council (ASC) is only one of dozens of similar extreme right-wing organisations exposing "subversive dissidents" by means of computers and electronic memory banks. The US press has reported that it mails its lists of "subversive elements" to 2,900 addresses. One announcement by the ASC leadership declared with unconcealed pride that its records were being used by Defence Department agencies and the arms industry as a source of information for their security measures, and also by many other periodicals, financial institutions, universities and colleges, charitable funds, industrial corporations, commercial houses and many other organisations.

The US journalist Eric Norden once visited the residence of Robert Bolivar Depugh, the man who heads the extreme right-wing "Minutemen" organisation, which enjoys mutual loyalty with US agencies. Norden says that he found Depugh in a big office cluttered up with old newspapers and magazines, with the only furniture consisting of eight steel filing cabinets, each with a different lock. Depugh showed him the filing cabinets, which, he said, contained specified records of subversive elements, but only for the State of California. Each unit had a corresponding number in the filing centre at headquarters. The records for California contained 18,000 names, classified according to importance: Index A contained the names of confused "fellow-travellers" and various "pinks" or, to be more precise, those who had merely associated themselves with various Communist organisations or had been spotted on picket lines, but were not officials. These were kept under constant surveillance, even if they were no more than amateurs, who were to be taken under tighter control, if they became more dangerous. Index B contained files on those who were one rung higher up the scale of subversion: party members and those who had burned their draft cards and agitators for human rights. He added that if they had enough people they would keep an eye on them as well. He considered them to be essentially small fry. His eyes glittered when he opened the lowest drawer. That was Index C, containing the truly dangerous types, the officials, those who devoted all their time and energy to agitation, the most convinced enemies of the United States in California. These were the "sons of

bitches" to whom the "Minutemen" gave the greatest attention. Norden asked Depugh that if they were convinced that these people were traitors, what would they do about it. Depugh smiled and said: "Effective measures, when the times comes." Norden: "Will that include killings?" Depugh replied in an unconcerned voice: "Everyone who is listed in Index C has betrayed his country to its arch-enemies, the most terrible of any it has ever had to face. The punishment for treason is death, and if the execution of the sentence is assigned to us, we shall do our duty." He smiled and added: "Don't be afraid, your name is not on the New York list. I checked that before you came over here."

Those are the "forces of light" for whom the Oceania in the United States is a "land of boundless opportunities" in the full sense of the word.

But let us examine at least two other sources, which give an even more colourful picture of the down-to-earth legacy of Orwell's "Ministry of Love". Charles J. Allen, the author of *Concentration Camps, USA*, which was published in New York in 1967, describes the Federal Prison Camp at Wickenburg in Arizona, one of six set up in the United States under the McCarran Act. It was situated a few hundred yards from the highway, the only one running across that desert area, and consisted of low barrack buildings surrounded by a barbed wire fence. It was one of the internment camps that would be used in the event the President of the United States declared a "state of emergency in view of a threat to internal security".

Americans could find themselves in such camps

whether on the basis of "suspicion" or whether they were "secretly intending to engage in spying or sabotage".

Since 1952, this and five other similar concentration camps have been prepared in such a way as to allow the internment of several thousand citizens. Indeed, proposals to make use of them were made even during the war in Korea: on more than twenty occasions, US congressmen and senators tried to have a "state of emergency" proclaimed on the basis of "available evidence" that the Communists were about to take over the country by their "subversive activity".

The war in Vietnam could very well have produced such an atmosphere and enabled the President to declare a "state of emergency", in which case the internment camps would have been packed with thousands of US citizens overnight.[2]

Let us recall the indignant last-hour statement by Senator William Langer, a Republican from North Dakota, one of the small group of congressmen who fought against the McCarran Act in the stormy days of 1950, when the country was carrying on a war more than 10,000 miles away from its shores, in Korea, and was in the grip of the disastrous hysteria of McCarthyism.

In a long indictment of the McCarran Act, William Langer declared that it was leading America into concentration camps, which were undoubtedly designed to

[2]In 1952, the FBI had a list of 26,000 Americans who would have been interned in such camps as soon as a "state of emergency" was proclaimed.

serve only one purpose, namely, to incarcerate those the powers that he did not like.

Having pronounced these words, he collapsed and died. As he was being carried out from the Senate Hall, a reporter said: "There goes the Bill of Rights".

Another testimonial comes from last spring. The US weekly *Spotlight* reported that on April 5, 1984, the White House issued a top secret directive code-named "REX-84", under which ten large internment camps are to be rapidly built in the United States. The four main ones — each for 25,000 persons — are to be located in Fort Chaffee (Arkansas), Fort Drum (New York), Fort Indian Gap (Pennsylvania), and Camp - A. P. Hill (Virginia). Other camps, the weekly said, were to be built in Oakland, California (for 15,000 persons), at the air force base in Southern Florida, in California, in Wisconsin, in Georgia, in Arizona, and near Miami, Florida, in the southern centre of the internment camp of the Justice Department.

This far-flung police operation has two objectives. A US Army spokesman told *Spotlight* that the first — and publicly announced — raid would be directed against illegal immigrants and refugees. But he also admitted that, on the basis of the secret "REX-84" directive, there would also be a massive round-up of suspects who could be interned in these centres on the basis of that emergency directive whether they were or were not US citizens. The second objective of the operation, the weekly went on, was code-named C. and C. — Capture and Custody — and was aimed against political opponents, those who refused to do military service or those

whom the government regarded as "dangerous" because of their criticism of its policies.

A *Spotlight* correspondent also interviewed a member of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), who was called Robert Blair, that is, a man who by sheer chance had the same name as the author of *1984*: Eric Arthur Blair, whose namesake, on the payroll of Oceania's "Ministry of Love", admitted that "REX-84" was the code-name of a top-secret project adopted only a week before it was leaked to the weekly. It was a "secret supplement" to the series of presidential decrees on "strengthening national security and preparations for an emergency situation".

Following the publication of these facts in *Spotlight*, the White House took further steps to cover up the operation. A warning was issued that "REX-84" was subject to the most stringent secrecy because of its importance from the standpoint of national security, there was a lightning raid on the offices of the police and the justice department, which led to the disappearance of all written documents that had any bearing on the "project". Only a few leading officials of counter-intelligence, the police and the justice department were entitled to have in their possession documents on the existence and progress of the operation.

The White House rejected a request from the editors of *Spotlight* for more information on "Project REX-84", and merely confirmed that this was a top-secret project, which was only one of the scenarios worked out for similar purposes by 26 US governmental agencies. Together with the adoption of "REX-84", the National Security

Directive No. 138 was also approved. It envisaged, among other things, the appropriation of $ 10 million to pay for governmental informers on matters relating to national security. *Spotlight* added that some of them were paid as much as a hundred thousand dollars.

Not many illusions are left even among the advocates of "oligarchical collectivism" reigning in the "hierarchical society" of the United States. Even before news of the "REX-84" (whose very name smacks of imperial grandeur) reached the public, some bitter admissions were made by R. Rindger, an ideologist of neo-conservatism, when he said that in the United States there was actually a one-party system, a "demopublican party" camouflaged in the form of the Democratic and Republican parties, a party that is quick to rear its totalitarian head whenever it feels threatened in any way.

Anti-Constitutional Practices of the "Protectors of the Constitution"

In Oceania, the "Thought Police" was engaged in stamping out "Thoughtcrime", and it is reminiscent of the "criminal activity" of those who are being hounded under the West German Berufsverbot. By 1977, more than a million citizens of the FRG had been subjected to the indignities of "interviews" organised by the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution. The result was that 5,000 people were deprived of their right to work in their professional field, or were banned from taking up new jobs. Among them were not only Communists, but also activists of various anti-fascist and anti-war organisations. Nor were they only employees of the state administration, but also teachers and even engine-drivers and postmen. There was no doubt that the non-conformism of these employees posed a threat that could shatter the very foundations of "pluralist democracy".

The mechanism, which is well known to those who have been victimised by "constitutional protection", was described by the French researcher Robert Boure in a book entitled *Professional Bans in the Federal Republic of Germany*. He says:

"When the management of an enterprise receives a job application, it refers to the office concerned requesting it to provide what is ultimately secret information about the applicant. In the event the applicant is on the register (which in itself is suspicious) and that register gives ground for doubting his political loyalties with respect to the 'free and democratic order', the employers inform the applicant in writing about their apprehensions which impede his employment. . . Among the most frequent motivations are: membership of the German Communist Party (or support for it), participation in demonstrations and rallies, which are not prohibited, the circulation of leaflets and equally — which carries even more weight — purely private activity, living together with persons who are already entered on the index, and mere contact with a member of the German Communist Party. The management's doubts sometimes spring from the mere fact that the applicant had used the term 'professional ban', for the constitutional court equates these words with subversive activity.

"When an applicant has been informed of the management's apprehensions, he can submit his answer in two ways: either by replying in writing, in which case,

however, he risks being suspected that he has something to conceal, or to reply orally in the course of a 'hearing' (a euphemism for an interrogation). . . The questions put to him have nothing in common with those which normally interest management in the course of traditional interviews with applicants for jobs. Nor do they relate only to the applicant's political views ('Are you a Marxist?', 'Have you read Marx?', 'What is your opinion of Professor X.'s lectures?', 'Have you used the term imperialism when speaking of FRG policy?'), but also to his private life (. . . 'Why do you continue to meet Mrs. X., although you know about her membership of the party?')."

The meddlesome watchfulness of the Federal "protectors of the Constitution" is also resented by the advocates of liberalism, and even by those who do not believe in remaining aloof from any schemes of the "Ministry of Truth", its Federal branches and its overseas headquarters. Here is part of a report carried by the Hamburg *Stern*:

Teacher I. Hausladen, who wanted to be appointed to an eight-year school, was explaining during a hearing before the government official Herzer why he considered himself to be an anti-fascist and why he made no secret of the fact in public:

"My grandfather fought against the Nazis. He spent 11 years in the Dachau concentration camp and died shortly after liberation. My grandmother was imprisoned at Ravensbrück. My father managed to emigrate in good time, but he was later caught by the Gestapo in France and thrown behind bars.'

"Herzer: 'We are very sorry about the difficulties which your family has had to undergo. But is that a good reason for allowing you to work at a state institution? That is quite another matter altogether. What criticism can you make of the GDR?'

"Hausladen: 'There is no doubt that one will find shortcomings deserving of criticism in any country, in every system. However, I have not studied the laws of the GDR and cannot judge about things only from hearsay.'

"State official Krüger: 'You know very well what we are asking you about. Don't pretend to be a simpleton. In the course of the electoral campaign there was talk of the Communist threat. It looks as though you did not hear about it.'

"Herzer: 'What is your idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat?'

"Hausladen: 'That's a scientific concept, I have not studied it.'

"Herzer: 'But you must be able to say something about it, after all, the concept speaks for itself.'

"Hausladen: 'Well, it's a concept worked out mainly by Marx and Lenin. . .'

"Herzer: 'Now, we have at last got to the root of the matter. Mrs. Teichmann, put the following down: I am an adherent of the dictatorship of the proletariat as Marx and Lenin saw it'."

O'Brien's "collective solipsism" pales before that kind of iron logic.

Active struggle for peace and against another round

in the arms race is, however, a "Thoughtcrime". Thus, the organisers of mass demonstrations in Brussels last year against the deployment of new US missiles had to pay a fine of 900,000 Belgian francs, while up to 500 people were arrested following brutal police attacks in dispersing a mass demonstration in front of the Bundestag, when it was debating NATO's "missile decision" last November. A peaceful demonstration staged in Livermore, California, the main centre of US "star wars" preparations, on June 20, 1983, led to the arrest of 900 people. Women mounting a vigil at the US base containing Cruise missiles at Greenham Common in Great Britain were systematically harassed; their camp was repeatedly destroyed by bulldozers alternating with attacks by the British police, including mounted police, and finally by paratroop commandos.

Several hundred of these anti-war women activists were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment.

Article 25 of the Belgian Constitution says: "Sovereignty belongs to the people." Article 20 of the FRG Constitution, like the constitutions of other West European countries, proclaims: "All state power comes from the people." The people's attitude to the Pershing and Cruise missiles was also established in public opinion polls taken on behalf of their governments. More than 80 per cent of Belgians, two-thirds of Dutchmen and Italians, and three-quarters of the citizens of the FRG came out against the deployment of US missiles in Western Europe.

It is even more difficult to "substantiate" (by the methods so obstinately practised by people like Councillor Herzer) the repression against those who so obviously voice the will of the overwhelming majority. What else can one do but give free reign to the imagination of the "Ministry of Love". The answer was found in the formation of special bands of provocateurs, armed with stones and bottles, which they threw at the well-armoured car of US Vice-President George Bush during his latest visit to Krefeld, when he was confronted by a 20,000-strong anti-war demonstration. They immediately provided the "good grounds" for restoring "law and order". Here is the evidence recently presented by the Dutch paper *De Volkskrant*:

"Up until recently, 42-year-old John Paul Gardiner was a welcome guest at the "peace camp' at Woensdrecht. Everyone assumed that this bearded fellow who always carried his baseball bat and spoke with a pronounced American accent, deserved to be admired. . . John was always out in front in the action at the air force base at Woensdrecht. John was popular. . .

"Last Thursday, John was exposed. On orders from his superiors, Sergeant Gardiner went to the 'peace camp' to infiltrate it... He had been recruited by the National Security Agency when he was a 20-year-old student at California University in 1961.

"Gardiner declared that he had decided to confess because he had felt the 'pangs of conscience'.

"You were at the 'peace camp' for about five months. What for?"

"I was ordered to try to infiltrate the group of activists

which, I was told, was being financed by the Russians. I passed on the information I got to my contacts in the Dutch security service."

"What results did you manage to achieve?"

"I discovered, for instance, that one of the actions was planned for February 18, and I informed the Dutch security service accordingly. As a result, armed units secretly surrounded the bunker and arrested the participants in the action."

"Why did you decide to end this work and not simply to disappear?"

"Never before did I have such a close understanding as with the people over here at Woensdrecht. It is hard to betray people who are so warm in their friendship."

"Did you receive from the secret services any information about the "peace camp' activists?"

"I did have access to some information: from the files, microfilms and computers which collect information about all the permanent inhabitants of the "peace camp'. In an emergency, I could obtain information within 15 minutes."

"What do you intend to do now?"

"To disappear, if am lucky. It is quite probable that they will soon find me, and then something could happen. They could, for instance, throw me in jail on a charge of breaking the US law which prohibits the publication of secret information. That means at least ten years in jail. I could also die from an overdose of drugs in some old barge in Amsterdam or be a victim in a car accident."

"Are you afraid?"

"Yes."

It was announced at a conference held in the West German Böblingen in January 1984 under the slogan "Stop the liquidation of democratic freedoms", that in view of the growing scope of the anti-nuclear movement, the FRG police and military counter-intelligence had carried out checks on 6.4 million citizens from the standpoint of "reliability".

The Technology of "Vaporisation"

"We do not merely destroy our enemies, we change them," O'Brien explained to Winston Smith at the Ministry of Love. "In the Middle Ages there was the Inquisition. It was a failure. It set out to eradicate heresy, and ended by perpetuating it... Why was that? Because the Inquisition killed its enemies in the open, and killed them while they were still unrepentant: in fact, it killed them because they were unrepentant... We do not make mistakes of that kind. All the confessions that are uttered here are true."

The screen version of Ken Kesey's novel *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* which satirises American society has an episode in which the rebel first receives electric shock treatment at a mental hospital to keep him quiet, then

saturated with drugs, and finally undergoes a lobotomy which turns him into an idiot. The Church Committee confirmed that this was more than a flight of literary fancy.

Seven Nazi "doctors" were sentenced to death and eight to long-term imprisonment by the Nuremberg Tribunal for having staged horrifying medical experiments on human beings in concentration camps. On that occasion, precise legal norms were laid down for any medical experiments involving human beings. Still, in the mid-1960s, the *British Medical Journal* carried an article signed by the pen-name "Partinax" which said that the author was worried by the fact that the World Health Organisation was going back on its commitments to prohibit the use of convicts as guinea-pigs for experiments. There was pressure from the American side to prevent the provision from being effective. Indeed, the author says, one US scientist declared that convicts in US correction centres were fine material for experiments, and that they were much cheaper than monkeys. He hoped, the author added, that the monkeys would not hear about that.

It was established in the course of the Church Committee investigations that from 1949 to 1963, the CIA had carried out research programmes on the control of human behaviour, and some of them were code-named "Bluebird", "Artishock", "MK-Ultra", "MK-Delta" and "MK-Search". Among those who took part were well-known scientific institutions like the Patax Institute of the state of Maryland, the John Hopkins' University, the State University of Maryland, and the National

Psychiatric Institute. In July 1977, *The New York Times* carried a report by J. Marks on these monstrous experiments. He said that during the investigations, the CIA deliberately gave less than a full picture of the experiments involving the use of narcotic preparations. Narcotics were only one component of the programme. J. Marks had documentary proof that other methods — electric shocks, irradiation with radioactive materials, ultra-sound, 'psychotherapy' and "special means for driving people mad' — were also used.

One of the main objectives of the programmes was to develop and test a system that would enable the CIA to force people to carry out orders regardless of their will and against such laws of nature as the instinct of self-preservation. A number of these experiments, J. Marks said, had ended in death, as a result of intoxication, suicide and frequently also murder. The experiments were carried out mainly on convicts in Atlanta, Bordentown, Providence and elsewhere.

The "brain-washing" to which the convicts were subjected was aimed to "change their personality" mainly by means of "shock therapy", wrote the US journalist Bettina Aptheker, and they have been repeatedly used on political prisoners in the United States. Thus, so-called fear powder, which causes a sense of panic fear and suffocation like that felt by a drowning man, was used on convicts in San Quentin, which is notorious for its brutal treatment of political prisoners.

In the course of the Senate investigations, the representatives of Langley asserted that it had abandoned such experiments back in 1963. The Church Committee established that most of the authentic documents indicating the full scope of the CIA action had been destroyed. However, one statement which then rang out in the Senate cast new light on the discoveries of the committee and the assertions of the CIA. The late Nelson Rockefeller insisted to members of the Church Committee that further investigations should be allowed to drift. Nor is there any need to comment on the statement by Admiral Stansfield Turner, chief of the CIA under the Carter Administration, who said in an article in *The New York Times* in 1977, that there could have been cases in which American citizens were subjected to other governmental experiments involving drugs without being aware of it, other than those mentioned during the investigations of these matters by the Senate in 1975.

Ronald Reagan paid a visit to Langley on December 4, 1981, to sign Presidential Decree No. 12333 on US intelligence activity, which once again restored the CIA's right to carry on virtually unlimited operations at home and abroad. The decree contains only two exceptions: it prohibits participation in murders and spying with murderous intent. How important these limitations are supposed to be can be seen from what has happened to hundreds of patriots in Central America and other parts of the world killed over the past several years by cutthroats in the pay of the CIA. Reagan's decree also nominally prohibits the staging of unauthorised experiments on living people, with one noteworthy exception: unless these are authorised by the Department of Health and Social Services.

US specialists have done much to advance world

medicine, but how can their efforts be promoted by the Langley decree? Even Orwell's fantasies would fall short of providing the answer.

In Orwell's Oceania, intractable individuals were "vaporised", but the world from which the novelist's runaway imagination took off has outdone the fantasy: its "Inner Party" is not above engaging in national or racial genocide.

Claude Lightfoot's book about US-style human rights recently appeared in New York. In it he recalls that on November 28, 1864, Sand Creek was the scene of the mass extermination of the Indian Cheyenne tribe by the Third Volunteer Regiment of the State of Colorado under the command of Colonel Cheewington, who issued the following order: "Kill and scalp everyone — adults and children." Women crying out for mercy were shot, others hacked to pieces. Children waving pieces of white cloth were killed, and pregnant women had their stomachs slit open. There were about 1,000 people at the Indian camp. Only three women and four children were taken prisoner and then exhibited in Denver like caged beasts. Soldiers showing off their scalps during the intermissions at Denver theatres were applauded.

The nominal equality of the races — but only on some basic rights — was codified in the Civil Rights Act of 1875. Before that, throughout the entire century from the foundation of the United States, there had not been a single provision prohibiting racial discrimination and genocide. Nor will one find the least mention of racial equality in the Declaration of Independence, or in the

first US Constitution or the Bill of Rights, which is a collection of the first ten amendments. Frederick Engels already had a perfect right to say that the remarkable thing about the specific bourgeois character of those human rights is that the US Constitution, the first Constitution to recognise human rights, in the same breath approved the existing slavery of the coloured people in the United States.

The 1965 international convention on eliminating every form of racial discrimination calls for a commitment on the part of states to prohibit and do away with racial discrimination and to ensure equality before the law of every man without regard to race, colour, or national or ethnic origin. It entered into force in 1969, the signatories numbering 100 states, among them naturally all the socialist countries. The United States and Israel failed to sign it.

The 1973 international convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of apartheid contains a commitment for states to take effective measures to prevent the crime of apartheid and to inflict punishment on persons guilty of it. It went into effect in June 1976, and was signed by dozens of states, including all the socialist countries. It was not accepted by the United States and some other Western countries.

The 1948 convention on the prohibition and punishment of the crime of genocide contained a commitment for states to take adequate measures to prevent genocide and to inflict punishment for the practice of it. It entered into force in January 1951, and was signed by

almost 100 countries, among them, quite naturally, all the countries of the socialist community. Once again, the United States refused to sign it.

The motivations behind this reluctance are obvious, and have been repeatedly identified by US sources. A report assessing the status of black people in the United States was submitted on April 15, 1961, by the Commission on Civil Rights to President John F. Kennedy. It said, among other things, that citizens of the United States were being killed, hounded by police dogs, harassed and terrorised only for wishing to take part in voting. Students were discriminated against and dying children were denied aid in consequence of the brutal and discriminatory decisions of the official leaders of the State of Mississippi, who had Federal funds at their disposal.

On June 22, 1978, following a long march to Washington, Indians handed in at the White House a "Manifesto of the American Indians", but the "free press" of the United States even failed to make any mention of it. We find a trace of it only in congressional documents.[3] The Manifesto said that President Carter had entered office with a proclamation on "human rights", but as far as the Indian people were concerned, it remained meaningless. They called on all the peoples of the world to ask the President how the United States respects human rights for the native inhabitants of that country.

"A policy of genocide is being carried out against our

[3] *Congressional Record*, July 27, 1978, H-7560-H-7461.

people. From 1971 to 1975, 24 per cent of our women were forcibly sterilised. American political and police institutions have mounted illegal military operations against our people like COINTELPRO.[4] These operations led to the violent death of several of our leading representatives. Patriots of native origin are suffering in many American jails."

From August 3 to 20, 1979, a representative international delegation of democratic lawyers worked in the United States on behalf of the United Nations following repeated requests from the National Congress of Black Lawyers, the National Union for Struggle against Racial and Political Repression, the Committee of Struggle for Racial Justice and several religious organisations. Among the members of the delegation were, together with lawyers from India, Nigeria and other developing countries, Chief Justice Par Eklund, Chairman of the Swedish Association of Democratic Lawyers and a specialist in the field of political and trade-union rights; Richard Harvey, a member of the Executive Committee of the British section of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers and a specialist in the field of political and trade-union rights; and many other competent

[4] COINTELPRO, a counter-intelligence programme approved by FBI Chief Hoover in 1956 sanctioning extensive secret operations against progressive US forces. In actual fact, such operations had been conducted from 1946. At first, it was aimed against the Communist Party of the United States and organisations sympathising with it, and its scope was steadily enlarged. In 1961, for instance, it was also aimed against the "Black Panthers", the "New Left", the so-called Socialist Workers' Party and a number of other movements and organisations.

specialists. They produced an impressive final document, which also contained indications of unlawful acts with respect to progressive white people. The lawyers reached the conclusion that there was sufficiently well-grounded evidence to show that human rights and the legal rights of the ethnic minorities were being systematically violated in the United States, and that a policy of racial discrimination and segregation was also being conducted. They discovered that racism and the abuse of political power were in many cases reflected in the procedural norms to such an extent that the most fundamental internationally recognised norms of legal procedure were not being observed with respect to some accused. They found that in cases in which the accused belonged to racial minorities there was sufficient evidence to show that sentences passed on them were exceptionally severe, and that ethnic groups which were a minority in the society at large constituted a majority in prison. They found that there were cases when prisoners belonging to racial minorities, while nominally able, were actually unable to have recourse to action to restore justice because in view of the formidable racist impediments their rights were in effect altogether illusory. They found that there was good ground for the conclusion that the government of the United States had conducted throughout the whole of its history a policy of systematic extinction of the native American population. In the recent period, these acts of aggression were aimed above all against the leading representatives and members of the movement for the defence of the American Indians who oppose that policy. That is why, the

lawyers said, they believed that the United Nations should carry out an exhaustive inquiry into these charges of the crime of genocide.

When Columbus discovered America, there were 12 million Indians on the territory of what is now the United States. Today, there is less than a million of them. Nevertheless, there is continued confiscation of hundreds of hectares of their land every year. Today, the isolation of the Indians in special "reservations" is paralleled only by Pretoria's Bantustans. Indian family earnings come to only a third of the national average. More than two-thirds of the Indians suffer from malnutrition. Unemployment among them is ten times the national average. Life expectancy among the Indians is only 44 years, and child mortality is three times as high as it is among the Whites. All these admissions were contained in a March 1978 issue of *US News and World Report*.

"Control of the Past": Political and Ideological Significance

Another directive of Oceania's Ministry of Truth said: "The mutability of the past is the central tenet of Ingsoc. He who controls the past, controls the future. . . Thus, history is continuously rewritten. This day-to-day falsification of the past, carried out by the Ministry of Truth, is as necessary to the stability of the regime as the work of repression and espionage carried out by the Ministry of Love. . . This process of continuous alternation was applied not only to newspapers, but to books, periodicals, pamphlets, posters, leaflets, films, sound-tracks, cartoons, photographs — to every kind of literature or documentation which might conceivably hold any political or ideological significance."

Today, one historical lesson is of exceptional "political and ideological significance": the memories of the Second World War. The crucial points which are relevant to our day about that war were expressed by the top representatives of the Western countries which were members of the anti-Hitler coalition.

General Charles de Gaulle, that dauntless fighter against fascist aggression, wrote long after the war: "The French know what Russia did, and they know that it was Russia that played the chief role in their liberation."

US President Franklin D. Roosevelt declared in mid-1943 that if things in Russia went on as they had done up to then, there would possibly be no need for a second front the following spring.

In September 1944, three months after the allied invasion of Normandy, the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill said that Russia was holding down and destroying immensely stronger forces than those facing the allies in the West.

R. Lockhart, General Director of the British Executive Committee for the Political Conduct of the War, wrote in the latter half of 1943 that he believed Russia had a real chance of winning the war without the West, and without Western aid altogether.

When the Wehrmacht went over to the wide counter-offensive on the Western front, US General George Patton wrote in his diary on January 4, 1945: "We could still lose this war. . . unless the Russian offensive comes off in the East."

The most serious historiographers admit as much. The British historian S. Patrick said that Germany had lost the Second World War on the fields of Russia, and

Second World War. The crucial points which are relevant to our day about that war were expressed by the top representatives of the Western countries which were members of the anti-Hitler coalition.

General Charles de Gaulle, that dauntless fighter against fascist aggression, wrote long after the war: "The French know what Russia did, and they know that it was Russia that played the chief role in their liberation."

US President Franklin D. Roosevelt declared in mid-1943 that if things in Russia went on as they had done up to then, there would possibly be no need for a second front the following spring.

In September 1944, three months after the allied invasion of Normandy, the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill said that Russia was holding down and destroying immensely stronger forces than those facing the allies in the West.

R. Lockhart, General Director of the British Executive Committee for the Political Conduct of the War, wrote in the latter half of 1943 that he believed Russia had a real chance of winning the war without the West, and without Western aid altogether.

When the Wehrmacht went over to the wide counter--offensive on the Western front, US General George Patton wrote in his diary on January 4, 1945: "We could still lose this war. . . unless the Russian offensive comes off in the East."

The most serious historiographers admit as much. The British historian S. Patrick said that Germany had lost the Second World War on the fields of Russia, and

not in Normandy. The West German historian K. Riecker said that when the Western allies mounted their attack on the fortress of Europe in the summer of 1944, Germany's defeat in Russia had already virtually decided the outcome of the Second World War. Germany lost the Second World War militarily even before the Western invasion.

Let us recall the statements of that period documenting the Soviet Union's contribution to the defeat of militarist Japan. At the end of 1944, Churchill said that without the USSR's participation the final defeat of the Japanese army would have called for vast sacrifices: about 1.5 million dead and wounded. US Secretary of State E. Stettinius wrote in his book *Roosevelt and the Russians: the Yalta Conference* that without Russia, victory over Japan could have cost the United States up to a million dead and wounded.

The actual facts tell an even more eloquent story. Here are the most important ones:

For over three whole years of the war — until the summer of 1944 — 92-95 per cent of the Wehrmacht's ground forces were concentrated on the Soviet-German front. In the 1945 winter and spring offensive alone, the Soviet Union destroyed 170 Nazi divisions, or about as many as the Anglo-American troops destroyed throughout the whole course of the war (176). Of the total losses suffered by Nazi Germany, 80 per cent of the losses were on the Soviet-German front, and this includes about 73 per cent of the aircraft and 75 per cent of the tanks, artillery pieces and other military hardware. Despite the fact that Nazi Germany had long prepared for the war and

Second World War. The crucial points which are relevant to our day about that war were expressed by the top representatives of the Western countries which were members of the anti-Hitler coalition.

General Charles de Gaulle, that dauntless fighter against fascist aggression, wrote long after the war: "The French know what Russia did, and they know that it was Russia that played the chief role in their liberation."

US President Franklin D. Roosevelt declared in mid-1943 that if things in Russia went on as they had done up to then, there would possibly be no need for a second front the following spring.

In September 1944, three months after the allied invasion of Normandy, the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill said that Russia was holding down and destroying immensely stronger forces than those facing the allies in the West.

R. Lockhart, General Director of the British Executive Committee for the Political Conduct of the War, wrote in the latter half of 1943 that he believed Russia had a real chance of winning the war without the West, and without Western aid altogether.

When the Wehrmacht went over to the wide counter--offensive on the Western front, US General George Patton wrote in his diary on January 4, 1945: "We could still lose this war. . . unless the Russian offensive comes off in the East."

The most serious historiographers admit as much. The British historian S. Patrick said that Germany had lost the Second World War on the fields of Russia, and

not in Normandy. The West German historian K. Riecker said that when the Western allies mounted their attack on the fortress of Europe in the summer of 1944, Germany's defeat in Russia had already virtually decided the outcome of the Second World War. Germany lost the Second World War militarily even before the Western invasion.

Let us recall the statements of that period documenting the Soviet Union's contribution to the defeat of militarist Japan. At the end of 1944, Churchill said that without the USSR's participation the final defeat of the Japanese army would have called for vast sacrifices: about 1.5 million dead and wounded. US Secretary of State E. Stettinius wrote in his book *Roosevelt and the Russians: the Yalta Conference* that without Russia, victory over Japan could have cost the United States up to a million dead and wounded.

The actual facts tell an even more eloquent story. Here are the most important ones:

For over three whole years of the war — until the summer of 1944 — 92-95 per cent of the Wehrmacht's ground forces were concentrated on the Soviet-German front. In the 1945 winter and spring offensive alone, the Soviet Union destroyed 170 Nazi divisions, or about as many as the Anglo-American troops destroyed throughout the whole course of the war (176). Of the total losses suffered by Nazi Germany, 80 per cent of the losses were on the Soviet-German front, and this includes about 73 per cent of the aircraft and 75 per cent of the tanks, artillery pieces and other military hardware. Despite the fact that Nazi Germany had long prepared for the war and

not in Normandy. The West German historian K. Riecker said that when the Western allies mounted their attack on the fortress of Europe in the summer of 1944, Germany's defeat in Russia had already virtually decided the outcome of the Second World War. Germany lost the Second World War militarily even before the Western invasion.

Let us recall the statements of that period documenting the Soviet Union's contribution to the defeat of militarist Japan. At the end of 1944, Churchill said that without the USSR's participation the final defeat of the Japanese army would have called for vast sacrifices: about 1.5 million dead and wounded. US Secretary of State E. Stettinius wrote in his book *Roosevelt and the Russians: the Yalta Conference* that without Russia, victory over Japan could have cost the United States up to a million dead and wounded.

The actual facts tell an even more eloquent story. Here are the most important ones:

For over three whole years of the war — until the summer of 1944 — 92-95 per cent of the Wehrmacht's ground forces were concentrated on the Soviet-German front. In the 1945 winter and spring offensive alone, the Soviet Union destroyed 170 Nazi divisions, or about as many as the Anglo-American troops destroyed throughout the whole course of the war (176). Of the total losses suffered by Nazi Germany, 80 per cent of the losses were on the Soviet-German front, and this includes about 73 per cent of the aircraft and 75 per cent of the tanks, artillery pieces and other military hardware. Despite the fact that Nazi Germany had long prepared for the war and

had forced the peoples of occupied Europe to work for it, in the course of the German aggression Soviet industry turned out double the volume of weapons and military hardware.

Going through the pages of the press today, which is so quick to lecture others about its "objectivity" and "freedom", one will find none of these facts, nor even the bare mention of what was being said in Washington and London forty years ago. There is a definite and concrete "political and ideological significance" in this uniform and deathly silence which has been prescribed for it. The fact is that everything that confirms the inevitable collapse of Hitler's "Drang nach Osten" presents a mirror image to the adventurism of the contemporary plans for a global and "victorious war".

Still, there are more and more people in the mass media, which are such a chemically pure alloy of "creative freedoms", whose trail was blazed by Winston Smith by his grim work at the Ministry of Truth. In the forefront is, quite naturally, the "Ministry of Peace": last May, the Pentagon, for instance, published the writings of Dwight D. Einsenhower from the year 1944. We find that it is not only the general's statements about the Soviet Union's role in the war that were censored. We find that what he said about the "great Russian ally" has also been deleted.

But the Pentagon was outdone by the Bundeswehr's Centre for Military History, which recently published "Attack on the Soviet Union", a semi-official "documentary study" running to 1,192 pages, issued as part of a voluminous publication under the title: "The

German Reich and the Second World War". The Bundeswehr's hired historians have tried once again to "prove" that Hitler's treacherous attack on the Soviet Union was, in fact, a "forced" or "pre-emptive" war. These "historians" merely succeed in displaying a "tendentious ignorance characteristic of careerists", as Engels once aptly put it.

The Syndromes and Ambitions of Atlantic Solidarity

Orwell's Oceania had a single metropolis, and the ambitions of its present-day metropolis are no less modest. Indeed, they have been characteristically echoed among its rivals:

Rudolf Augstein, publisher of the weekly *Der Spiegel*, wrote in 1982:

"We are not threatened because the Soviets would allegedly like to take over our lands. We are threatened because the United States has included in the calculation of its military budget 'limited' nuclear wars."

On March 10, 1983, Henry Nannen, publisher of the Hamburg *Stern*, wrote an "Open Letter to the Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl", in which he said:

"Now for the final word, Mr. Chancellor, but perhaps the most important one: it should always be borne in

mind that America is a society which is not represented only by the Reagans and the Weinbergers. Take a sceptical attitude to those who — as it has now become quite obvious — have for years, with the aid of the CIA, given a highly exaggerated assessment of Soviet armaments as a pretext for realising their own war ventures. One should be wary of those who are not thinking about a nuclear balance at the lowest possible level, and insist on America's absolute nuclear superiority, because they would like to weaken or destroy the Soviets by armed force, and because they believe that a nuclear war can be fought and won. . . When in your speeches at the last electoral meetings you asserted that the French and British missiles should not be counted because they served only defensive purposes, I hope that in saying that you did not imply that the US missiles are designed for attack. . . A German Federal Chancellor should not wish to have anything to do with people who reckon with 20 or even 80 million dead in order to build a new and better world (and those are authentic statements by Reagan's advisers). . ."

Even Winston Churchill was under no illusion about the role of the "forward-based nuclear arsenal" of the Pentagon and NATO in Western Europe, the new generation of which is even more alarming. As early as in 1951, he sounded the warning that by building up nuclear bases at home they were turning themselves into a target, possibly into the bull's-eye of the target.

General Anzeiger said:

"Reagan's policy of sanctions does less harm to the Soviet Union than it does to the European allies of the

United States. Reagan ignores their well-grounded arguments, their fundamental interests, and their treaty obligations."

Among the closest of the Atlantic "Big Brother's" kith and kin is his vigorous "Big Sister" on the Thames, but even she could not stand it on one occasion, and on December 8, 1983, she complained that the United States was keeping bank interest rates artificially high, so doing great harm to Great Britain and other European countries and de facto preventing them from making the investments they could have made but for the flight of capital to the United States. Let us add in the margin that in 1982, more than $ 42,000 million and in 1983, $ 60,000 million travelled that way from Western Europe to the United States.

Big Brother and his ilk were hardly amused to hear the Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme declare in the late 1970s:

"The red threat, the fairytales about Communists infiltrating the governments of Western Europe in order to establish Moscow's 'strongpoints' throughout their territory were invented in order to avoid explaining the causes of unemployment, poverty and alienation."

An unshakable self-assurance radiates from the image of Big Brother, as George Orwell depicted him for us. But in actual life, Big Brother is afflicted with an incurable syndrome. The vision of an Oceanic monopower, which appeared to be in sight at the height of the "cold war", has faded never to return. This also resulted from detente in the past decade, which was promoted, for a very good reason, mostly in Western Europe,

where the powers that be were forced to do so by pressure from the progressive, democratic and anti-war forces.

Detente made it possible to enhance Western Europe's independence in politics, and also to make it more competitive. On the threshold of the 1980s, *Business Week*, the mouthpiece of US business circles, sounded the alarm: the expansion of other monopolies into markets where US capital had until then ruled supreme had cost Big Brother's own country at least $ 125,000 million a year in lost profits.

The hectic efforts designed to keep the rivals of the United States in subordination yielded obvious results. It was highly unfortunate and risky for those who shouldered the burden of that effort: those who now adopt Big Brother's claims as their own — such as the turning of the western part of the European continent into the Pentagon's "nuclear hostage" — removes the last fig leaf from "Atlanticism". By doing so they tend to turn their backs on the most elementary national interests — and that in full view of their compatriots.

This cannot be ignored by those who have to play these unenvious roles, and that is why, as *Stuttgarter Zeitung* recently wrote: "In Western Europe, Reagan's policy finds itself on the operating-table. Everything that it does and says is instantly subjected to a critical analysis or is directly criticised." This is equally promoted by a trend that Oceania's own sources confirm most eloquently.

The Italian magazine *Panorama* wrote:

"The CIA is the only intelligence service whose

meddling in Italian politics has been proved by the US Congress, while its violent and bloody actions for the purpose of destabilising the internal political situation were extensively demonstrated in other lands — from Greece all the way to Chile."

Another Italian magazine *Giorni-Vie Nuove* said:

"There are 5,000 CIA agents in the Apennines, and the number of their collaborators comes to more than 10,000."

Former CIA agent V. Marketti says:

"The CIA has emergency plans in the event that Italy moves too far to the left. If the influence of the Communists and the Socialists should further markedly increase, there is no doubt at all that the CIA would back the 'Black Colonels' in Italy just as it had done earlier on in Greece."

However, *Panorama* and other liberal democratic journals in Italy presented even more convincing evidence, after the arrest of Licio Gelli, who had headed the secret Masonic lodge P-2 (he himself later mysteriously "disappeared" while in detention). Among Gelli's private papers impounded by the police, they found the secret instruction "FM-30-31" for US agents abroad. It had been drawn up by a group consisting of representatives of Washington's military and espionage services, under General W. Westmoreland, one-time US Army Chief of Staff.

The document sets out instructions for the use of terrorist groups in the allied countries (above all those where the Pentagon has its bases). In order to "control the political situation", US agents are instructed to

maintain secret ties with terrorist organisations, and use them "to create an atmosphere of political instability in the country if the need should arise". This political instability would provide the pretext for governmental repression against the democratic forces, with the Pentagon's support or even with its direct participation.

Among the measures US resident agents are to carry out in such a situation, says "FM-30-31", is the formation of paramilitary subversive groups, participation by armed provocateurs in demonstrations for the purpose of causing disturbances and clashes with the police, acts designed to discredit the courts and the police, infiltration of the state apparatus, bomb attacks, killings of police officers, and so on.

Another document, a report on which was contained in *Tribune des Nations* and which is called "Operational Plan No. 100-1 of the Supreme Commander of the US Armed Forces in Europe", contains an equal dose of "Atlantic solidarity". It says, among other things, that in the event of internal troubles in the NATO countries, such as armed uprisings or extensive disturbances, which could harm the security of US troops or jeopardise the fulfilment of their tasks, the government of the given country must do its utmost to re-establish law and order through its own efforts. However, if such measures turn out to be inadequate or if the government requests help, or if the Supreme Commander of the US forces should decide that the government is incapable of taking effective measures to establish law and order in the country, US troops can take action considered indispensable by the Supreme Commander. One can only be

heartily grateful for this kind of selfless assistance to those who were in two minds about where to look for the "limited sovereignty" that is such a favourite topic at Oceania's "Ministry of Truth".

The Heights of "Doublethink"

"Doublethink" was the ultimate test for anyone who wanted to have a place in the sun in Orwell's Oceania and to enjoy the privileges of the "Inner Party". "Doublethink means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them." This naturally implies "the power of not grasping analogues, of failing to perceive logical errors", the power "to deny the existence of objective reality", and "to tell deliberate lies when genuinely believing in them". In short, it means the "habit of impudently claiming that black is white, in contradiction of the plain facts,. . . it means a loyal willingness to *say* that black is white. . . But it means also the ability to *believe* that black is white, and more, to *know* that black is white."

Those were George Orwell's observations which must have inspired a group of people in Denver, USA, to set up some ten years ago a "Committee on Ambiguity", whose annual prize is designed to be "an ironical award for successes in mastering techniques which lead to gross error, confusion or contradiction". It is, in fact, "an unofficial crowning of the king of cheaters and liers".

The tenth-anniversary prize was awarded to none other than the incumbent President of the United States. What for? For aptly naming the first-strike MX--missile as the "peacekeeper" and for his speech in the Costa Rican parliament. In a situation in which the more sober-minded members of the "Inner Party" in the United States have been attacking Reagan's "big stick policy" in Central America (and elsewhere), the US President issued a warning to "any state which tries to destabilise its neighbour, which supports the dispatch of bandits to its territory and exports violence".

William Lutz, chairman of the "Committee on Ambiguity" spelled out the motivations for this modest though evidently well-justified decision concerning this year's Denver Prize.

He added that if anyone tried to win the Denver Prize a second time, his achievements in the field of Doublethink would have to be of a higher order than those which had earned him the first award.

Most of what would be duly appreciated by the Denver Committee was, for that reason, left in reserve for the eleventh contest which is to take place at the end of this year. Such a lack of confidence in the present laureate's capabilities is downright astounding, because

for the record holder, who has been running true to form and steadily improving, a year is more than enough time not just to equal last year's achievements, but to surpass them in every way.

We fully agree with the Denver Committee that what has been achieved up to now is quite enough to make one's head go round, but while in the act of giving credit where it is due, it is not right to forget about the other spokesmen for the US "Inner Party", because the dizzy heights of Doublethink to which Washington has now ascended are, after all, a synthetic achievement made up of long, hard and day-to-day efforts which no one will envy.

To win the Doublethink title one has to display the ability to scare a most naive public with the prospect of a "Soviet military threat", while inducing it to believe, with an equally picturesque description, how the socialist economy is going to the dogs and is about to collapse. In this classical event, the laureate of the Denver Committee's anniversary prize is undoubtedly well up in front. To blend these two glaring opposites some two--thirds of a century after the emergence of the socialist state certainly takes much more audacity than ever before. But the man who has won such unflattering laurels has also widened the gap between the two opposites of Doublethink to an unprecedented extent. He is also on record as having set the deadline for the end of socialism as nothing but an aberration — and it is the end of this century. At the same time, it is this waning aberration that was then accused of hatching terrible plans of a "disarming first nuclear strike". Indeed, it is these plans that

have required the United States alone to spend on weapons as much over the next five years as it did in the 35 years after the Second World War. Doublethink of that calibre can hardly be squared with the fact that the Soviet Union has publicly repudiated the first-use of nuclear weapons, while Washington and its nuclear allies have stubbornly refused to undertake a similar commitment.

One cannot help being amazed in considering another masterpiece of Doublethink: the West, as official documents of the Reagan era declare, cannot repudiate nuclear aggression because it is the only solid guarantee of the security of Western Europe and the United States. Why not? It is because the Warsaw Treaty has a superiority in conventional weapons which, however, numerous experts from the NATO countries have been unable actually to discover. The repeated proposals by the Warsaw Treaty countries that the NATO countries should join them in concluding a treaty on the mutual renunciation of force — whether nuclear or conventional — are said to be motivated precisely by that "superiority". Indeed, evidence of such a superiority is undoubtedly also provided by the NATO boycott of the initiatives of the socialist countries.

One could have laughed at the most recent wave of Doublethink had it not been such a serious matter. The militarisation of space has been declared by Washington to be a deliberate plan on Moscow's part. That is perhaps why the Soviet Union has made constructive proposals for a treaty to prevent such a threat. The stubborn efforts by the United States to frustrate the adop-

have required the United States alone to spend on weapons as much over the next five years as it did in the 35 years after the Second World War. Doublethink of that calibre can hardly be squared with the fact that the Soviet Union has publicly repudiated the first-use of nuclear weapons, while Washington and its nuclear allies have stubbornly refused to undertake a similar commitment.

One cannot help being amazed in considering another masterpiece of Doublethink: the West, as official documents of the Reagan era declare, cannot repudiate nuclear aggression because it is the only solid guarantee of the security of Western Europe and the United States. Why not? It is because the Warsaw Treaty has a superiority in conventional weapons which, however, numerous experts from the NATO countries have been unable actually to discover. The repeated proposals by the Warsaw Treaty countries that the NATO countries should join them in concluding a treaty on the mutual renunciation of force — whether nuclear or conventional — are said to be motivated precisely by that "superiority". Indeed, evidence of such a superiority is undoubtedly also provided by the NATO boycott of the initiatives of the socialist countries.

One could have laughed at the most recent wave of Doublethink had it not been such a serious matter. The militarisation of space has been declared by Washington to be a deliberate plan on Moscow's part. That is perhaps why the Soviet Union has made constructive proposals for a treaty to prevent such a threat. The stubborn efforts by the United States to frustrate the adop-

tion of such a document also appear to be the weightiest proof of its "peaceful" intentions. And these intentions, the White House itself has made clear by demonstrating its attitude to the problem of control, are aimed to turn outer space into another Pentagon base: "measures for the control of weapons in space are desired not as an end in themselves, but only to the extent to which they help to strengthen our potential." The "peace Doublethink" book of records, with Orwell's "War is peace" for its motto, has beyond doubt been enriched by yet another entry.

"Doublethink" cannot, however, rest on such a flimsy basis as would be provided only by its dependence on the purely private initiatives of those who are engaged in setting records in this field. Orwell himself realised that "Doublethink" made sense only if it became a universally applicable standard subject to strict control. For that reason, let us page through its codes:

Among the ten to which the "Ministry of Truth" refers most frequently to this very day is the "Canons of Journalism" which the American newsmen association adopted in 1925. Among the "fundamental principles" of Oceanic journalism which it lists are "responsibility, freedom, independence, sincerity, truthfulness and accuracy, honesty and decency". We also find the following formulations: "The publication of commentaries which are known to assert untruths is a breach of the spirit of American journalism." "It is unfit for an American journalist to serve any other purpose than truthful informing of the public." "News must not be published without the public being made aware of its source."

have required the United States alone to spend on weapons as much over the next five years as it did in the 35 years after the Second World War. Doublethink of that calibre can hardly be squared with the fact that the Soviet Union has publicly repudiated the first-use of nuclear weapons, while Washington and its nuclear allies have stubbornly refused to undertake a similar commitment.

One cannot help being amazed in considering another masterpiece of Doublethink: the West, as official documents of the Reagan era declare, cannot repudiate nuclear aggression because it is the only solid guarantee of the security of Western Europe and the United States. Why not? It is because the Warsaw Treaty has a superiority in conventional weapons which, however, numerous experts from the NATO countries have been unable actually to discover. The repeated proposals by the Warsaw Treaty countries that the NATO countries should join them in concluding a treaty on the mutual renunciation of force — whether nuclear or conventional — are said to be motivated precisely by that "superiority". Indeed, evidence of such a superiority is undoubtedly also provided by the NATO boycott of the initiatives of the socialist countries.

One could have laughed at the most recent wave of Doublethink had it not been such a serious matter. The militarisation of space has been declared by Washington to be a deliberate plan on Moscow's part. That is perhaps why the Soviet Union has made constructive proposals for a treaty to prevent such a threat. The stubborn efforts by the United States to frustrate the adop-

tion of such a document also appear to be the weightiest proof of its "peaceful" intentions. And these intentions, the White House itself has made clear by demonstrating its attitude to the problem of control, are aimed to turn outer space into another Pentagon base: "measures for the control of weapons in space are desired not as an end in themselves, but only to the extent to which they help to strengthen our potential." The "peace Doublethink" book of records, with Orwell's "War is peace" for its motto, has beyond doubt been enriched by yet another entry.

"Doublethink" cannot, however, rest on such a flimsy basis as would be provided only by its dependence on the purely private initiatives of those who are engaged in setting records in this field. Orwell himself realised that "Doublethink" made sense only if it became a universally applicable standard subject to strict control. For that reason, let us page through its codes:

Among the ten to which the "Ministry of Truth" refers most frequently to this very day is the "Canons of Journalism" which the American newsmen association adopted in 1925. Among the "fundamental principles" of Oceanic journalism which it lists are "responsibility, freedom, independence, sincerity, truthfulness and accuracy, honesty and decency". We also find the following formulations: "The publication of commentaries which are known to assert untruths is a breach of the spirit of American journalism." "It is unfit for an American journalist to serve any other purpose than truthful informing of the public." "News must not be published without the public being made aware of its source."

tion of such a document also appear to be the weightiest proof of its "peaceful" intentions. And these intentions, the White House itself has made clear by demonstrating its attitude to the problem of control, are aimed to turn outer space into another Pentagon base: "measures for the control of weapons in space are desired not as an end in themselves, but only to the extent to which they help to strengthen our potential." The "peace Doublethink" book of records, with Orwell's "War is peace" for its motto, has beyond doubt been enriched by yet another entry.

"Doublethink" cannot, however, rest on such a flimsy basis as would be provided only by its dependence on the purely private initiatives of those who are engaged in setting records in this field. Orwell himself realised that "Doublethink" made sense only if it became a universally applicable standard subject to strict control. For that reason, let us page through its codes:

Among the ten to which the "Ministry of Truth" refers most frequently to this very day is the "Canons of Journalism" which the American newsmen association adopted in 1925. Among the "fundamental principles" of Oceanic journalism which it lists are "responsibility, freedom, independence, sincerity, truthfulness and accuracy, honesty and decency". We also find the following formulations: "The publication of commentaries which are known to assert untruths is a breach of the spirit of American journalism." "It is unfit for an American journalist to serve any other purpose than truthful informing of the public." "News must not be published without the public being made aware of its source."

"A periodical must not publish materials harming anyone's reputation unless he is given an opportunity to defend himself."

That is the backround which brings out most glaringly that which is said, for instance, in the CIA instructions on "How to Prepare Propaganda Broadcasts", and they are not only the official instructions for Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty and other pirate stations broadcasting to the socialist and to some developing countries. They also lay down the guidelines for the ramified network of CIA agents in journalism which is addressed to the Western public itself. Among these representatives of the "free press" are not just hundreds of US journalists. This was shown by a publication entitled *CIA Insider*, which has been published on two occasions by a group of liberal West European journalists. They put together some very telling facts to prove that among the CIA's long-standing paid collaborators are, among others, a leading commentator of the London *Times* Lord Chalfont, the commentator of the West German Television Löwenthal, the publisher of the Paris weekly *l'Express* Jean Francois Revel, the Italian publicist Arrigo Levi, some of the people working for the Springer concern, and so on. Indeed, until he died recently, Raymond Aron, the leading writer of the Paris *Le Figaro* and one of the leading practitioners of Oceanic apologetics and of the science of "hate weeks" was also on the payroll of the CIA.

Let us return to the above-mentioned CIA document, which, among other things, says:

"22. Never recall things that could hurt your interest.

Simply say nothing about them. It is not your business to give both sides of a problem. . .

26. Always try to create the impression that you are omniscient, that you were in the place about which you are reporting, and that you have access to secret information. . .

27. Accuse, accuse and accuse yet again. This strategic move can be regarded as truly the most effective kind of propaganda.

48. Spread slander and doubt, but never call them as such. . .

51. Never use information simply to inform. It is not in your interest to have the most informed audience in the true sense of the word. Your interest lies above all in your audience being informed according to your intents and purposes."

The "Doublethink", which is the source of the recipes of the "Ministry of Truth" (and, strictly speaking, also of the "Ministry of Love", which is here quite indispensable, too) has just behind it, but not far away, the changing face of their statutes. The "free exchange of information and ideas" is the version that is designed for the public at large, and in this context it is interesting to learn what the protagonists in this "free exchange" themselves think about it:

In October 1982, Deutschlandfunk, the West German radio station, declared:

"The main goal of propaganda beamed to the socialist countries is. . . to inject the poison of disintegration."

Paul Lendvai, who now heads the so-called Eastern Bureau of Austrian Radio and Television, which is regarded as a leading instrument of the above-mentioned "free exchange", wrote in a book entitled *The Media War*:

"The aim of Western influence through the medium of the screen and the radio is. . . to incite a climate of social tension."

Writing in the West German magazine *Europäische Wehrkunde*, a prominent practitioner of US radio propaganda beamed to the socialist countries made no secret that:

"Present-day propaganda across the 'iron curtain' seeks above all to disrupt the relations between the leadership and the population in the enemy countries. . . It is increasingly marked by a subversive orientation of its goals."

This kind of ingenuous admission of how black is that which is ostensibly white is a truly welcome helping hand, especially to anyone who may still be labouring under the opposite impression. And it could also be a helping hand to those who are unable to understand why we regard this kind of "free exchange" as an intolerable violation of international treaties and law, and why it is this kind of "free exchange", and not the socialist countries' resolute rebuff of efforts to legalise it, that is a gross breach of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

* * *

It is said in Orwell's country that facts are stubborn things. Indeed, they are so stubborn that they tend to penetrate even to the sources from which

the "Ministry of Truth" itself so vigilantly draws its information. Indeed, even from observation points that give such a limited view, it is perfectly clear where one should look for the actual amphitheatre of Orwell's vision. The syndrome which is growing right through the organism of the "hierarchical society", the last society of that type in human history, echoes the suggestive images of *1984*. Orwell's literary fiction anticipated many of the elements now constituting the anatomy of state monopoly "oligarchic collectivism". This doubly applies to its bastions across the sea where its oligarchic ambitions are also gathering momentum against its own allies.

Nothing of this is altered by the fact that Orwell regarded the danger, against which he so passionately rebelled, as some kind of abstract and extra-historical force, which is why he erroneously connected it not only with the society from whose antagonisms it logically grows, but also with the state power of the workers and of all the other working people. This vision, however, is not just a weakness of George Orwell's. That is why the following questions are all the more relevant:

What is the source of that "permanent hatred" for socialism of which none of the protagonists of the reactionary panopticon of our century make any secret?

What are the charges that the Ministries of "Truth", "Love" and "Peace" so hotly level at socialism?

Why is it that, in contrast to the rulers of Orwell's "superstate", they keep preparing for a "victorious war"?

Why have they put their stake on it despite warnings

coming even from their own ranks that it would mean suicide?

There is only one explanation that is not a clumsy travesty of logic. That kind of wild madness can be aroused only by a society which is not a further development but an epitome of the credo of the Oceanic oligarchy, a society which has ended up with the privileges and the social partitions which have long since lost any justification whether in Orwell's or in the real world. The main thing which makes socialism so different from the past has finally got through even to those who write in *Foreign Affairs*: about twenty years ago, it said that our "purposeful altruism" cannot self-evidently be introduced by decree. Indeed, it is an attitude that has to make headway, every foot of it, through the thick wall of inertia.

Its roots have been growing over the thousands of years of "hierarchical society". The beginnings of the socialist civilisation are only a few decades old, but they already strike the eye even today:

The world of socialism has no knowledge of unemployment and social uncertainty, hunger, illiteracy, crime waves, terrorism and drug-addiction, or any of the other disorders that are yet to disappear from the metropolis of "Oceania".

The world of socialism was not guilty of starting a single one of the dozens of wars which have cost over 20 million lives since 1945.

The economy of the socialist world keeps developing twice and even three times faster than the economy of "Oceania", which thrives on the exploitation of former

colonies. The economy of the socialist world does not provide unearned incomes for anyone, nor does it breed poverty and the need to rely on charitable institutions.

The behaviour of the "Oceanic oligarchy" itself reveals ever more pronounced signs of the fact that socialism exists and is gaining in strength. Indeed, it is the position and influence of socialism that prevent the oligarchy's most bellicose wing from starting another world war. It keeps narrowing down the area in which the struggle for national liberation and social emancipation can still be drowned in blood. It forces the oligarchy to develop bourgeois democratic methods for its rule and to resort to "social manoeuvring" where not very long ago it was able to force through its self-seeking interests without the least scruple.

"George Orwell," says the West German *Stern*, "is the most published and most widely read British writer of the 20th century." A part of the credit for this goes to the obscurantist "forces of light", and this has been broadcast far and wide. But even the lot which has befallen this work of Orwell's is part of the evidence which shows for what aims literature is turned into a pawn of politics. We do not underestimate the strength of these forces, but we resolutely refuse to overestimate them either. The interest which Orwell expressed in "Oceania", and which has raged for more than a third of a century, cannot be maintained only for cold-war purposes, because its roots are very much deeper.

Is that interest rooted in Orwell's literary skill? Nothing is said about it by 90 per cent of those who identify themselves with Orwell in every other respect. Does it

perhaps lie in that high-minded moral thinking which to this day charms us in the writings of Shakespeare, Cervantes, Tolstoy, Romain Rolland, Steinbeck or, for instance, Garcia Marquez in the recent period? Or in the works of Ernest Hemingway, Mikhail Sholokhov, Erich Maria Remarque, Karl Ludwig Opitz, Anna Seghers or Julius Fučík and dozens of other writers who, like George Orwell, were inspired by the memories of fascist barbarism. Edward Cornish believes that Orwell's vision should not be the only one made accessible to young people, because it could easily lead to despair and passivity. Professor W. Warren Wagar, one of those who took part in the discussion in the *Futurist*, says that the vocabulary and the world-view of Orwell's *1984* have been implanted into the subconscious of every half-educated man of the Western civilization. Unfortunately, he adds, that has obviously done more harm than good.

The source of Orwell's popularity lies obviously above all in the scope of his work, the fact that the feelings and fears of his characters ring true for millions of those who live in the "Western civilization". And that is a relevant answer to the question of who has the strongest claim to being Big Brother.

JOSEF SKALSKÝ

Who Has the Strongest Claim to Being Big Brother

ORWELL'S 1984
— ILLUSIONS
AND REALITIES

Translated by
ZDENĚK KRATOCHVÍL
Cover and lay-out by
MILOŠ POZDĚNA
Editing completed in August 1984
ORBIS PRESS AGENCY,
Prague 1984